

FEB 16 '39

TP; I - post w

INDEXED

9905  
RDTA 301

# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

FOUNDED BY PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION OF  
THE DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES  
IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS - PUBLISHERS

30  
1939  
31'

RDTA  
92

VOLUME XXX · FEBRUARY 1939 · NUMBER ONE



# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

FOUNDED BY PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION OF  
THE DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES  
IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

VOLUME XXX

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS  
PUBLISHERS • NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**59326B**

ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS  
M 1940 L



# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION

HORATIO SMITH, *General Editor*

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

ARTHUR LIVINGSTON

DINO BIGONGIARI

HENRI F. MULLER

LOUIS CONS

FEDERICO DE ONÍS

W. M. FROHOCK

MARIO A. PEI

JOHN L. GERIG

NORMAN L. TORREY

JUSTIN O'BRIEN, *Secretary*

VOLUME XXX

FEBRUARY 1939

NUMBER I

## ARTICLES

Anglo-Norman Studies	RUTH J. DEAN	3
Dante Notes	H. D. AUSTIN	15
Materials for a Reappraisal of Sixteenth-Century French Society	L. CLARK KEATING	20
Racine's <i>Bérénice</i>	LACY LOCKERT	26
New Voltaire-Gabriel Cramer Letters	F. J. CROWLEY	39
On the Origin of French Word-Order	HENRI F. MULLER	52
<i>Fermez donc votre porte</i>	LEO SPITZER	63

## REVIEWS

Maria Sofia De Vito, <i>L'Origine del dramma liturgico</i> . [GRACE FRANK]	69
Henri Focillon, <i>Art d'Occident: le moyen âge roman et gothique</i> . [EMERSON H. SWIFT]	71
Wilhelmine Wirtz, <i>Flore et Blancheflor nach der Pariser Handschrift 375 (A)</i> . [HERBERT K. STONE]	75
Georges Doutrepont and Omer Jodogne, <i>Chroniques de Jean Molinet</i> . [LOUIS CONS]	77

J. P. Wickersham Crawford, <i>Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega</i> . [JOSEPH E. GILLET]	80
Jean Boorsch, <i>Etat présent des études sur Descartes</i> . [WILLIAM MCC. STEWART]	80
Forrest Eugene Spencer and Rudolph Schevill, <i>The Dramatic Works of Luis Vélez de Guevara, Their Plots, Sources, and Bibliography</i> . [JOHN M. HILL]	84
Louis Réau, <i>L'Europe française au siècle des lumières</i> . [FERNAND BALDENSPERGER]	90
Joseph F. Jackson, <i>Louise Colet et ses amis littéraires</i> . [JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ]	96
Georges Lemaitre, <i>Four French Novelists</i> . [W. M. FROHOCK]	98
Peider Lansel, <i>The Raeto-Romans</i> . [WILLIAM FRAUENFELDER]	99
Joseph Linskill, <i>Saint Léger, Etude de la langue du manuscrit de Cler- mont-Ferrand, suivie d'une édition critique du texte</i> . [HENRI F. MULLER]	100
Books Received	103
Notes for Contributors	107

THE ROMANIC REVIEW is published four times a year (February-April-October-December) by Columbia University Press, 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wisconsin, or 2960 Broadway, New York City. Single copies, \$1.00 (foreign, \$1.10); \$4.00 a year (foreign, \$4.30). Subscribers should notify the publisher of change of address at least three weeks before publication of issue with which change is to take effect. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Menasha, Wisconsin, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1939 by Columbia University Press.

Manuscripts, editorial communications and books for review should be addressed to Professor Horatio Smith, 513 Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York City. THE REVIEW will not be responsible for the return of manuscripts unless accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. For all questions regarding preparation of manuscripts and printing style, consult the "Notes for Contributors" at the end of the February issue.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to Columbia University Press, Room 108, 2960 Broadway, New York City.

## ANGLO-NORMAN STUDIES

---

### I

INTEREST in Anglo-Norman texts goes back to the latter years of the eighteenth century. But serious study of Anglo-Norman language and literature has followed an uneven and often unsatisfactory course. Only a few syntheses of the accumulated detail of research have been possible, and these, as their authors are the first to admit, cannot yet be definitive. A number of problems are unsolved and many interesting and valuable subjects await investigation. This article will sketch very briefly the history of Anglo-Norman studies and indicate some of the work which needs most urgently to be done.

It is sufficient to note rapidly the well-known difficulties and characteristics of Anglo-Norman. French syllabic prosody is so irregularly followed that many have thought another scheme must have guided Anglo-Norman poets; but it has not been possible to deduce an accentual one similar to English or Germanic practice. One of the usual two tests for pronunciation and grammar therefore fails, and linguistic conclusions must be based chiefly on rhyme. This leaves us in some doubt as to the chronology of certain developments and how to share responsibility between scribe and author for irregularities in morphology and syntax. The next outstanding characteristic is the rapidity of phonological development and of breakdown in inflections. Many of the details of these phenomena are not peculiar to Anglo-Norman: they are natural physiological and psychological developments which took place in the course of time in most dialects of French. Some of them were more rapid in any peripheral dialect than in the central ones, others were undoubtedly hastened in Anglo-Norman by contact with English: in phonology by the heavy stresses and strong recessive accent, in morphology and syntax by flexions and constructions peculiar to English. As for the extremely unstable spelling of Anglo-Norman, which seems to be the despair of French scholars, it is quite as explicable as the apparently illogical spelling of modern English, and has been specially studied by Professor Pope in her recent grammar,<sup>1</sup> which we shall presently consider in more detail.

Anglo-Norman literature is preponderantly religious and practical, in conformity with the character of the Normans. The earliest transla-

1. *Infra*, note 53.

tion into French of any section of the Bible is the Anglo-Norman *Li Quatre Livre des Reis*. Translations of other books of the Bible, theological manuals or encyclopedias, legends and lives of saints, moralized tales, are among the compositions which ministered to the spiritual needs of the Anglo-Normans. Religious fervor inspired their best lyric poetry and produced in Anglo-Norman the earliest masterpiece of French serious drama: *The Mystère d'Adam*. To their interest in the scientific knowledge of the time we have the witness of Anglo-Norman Bestiaries, Lapidaries, a Computus, and minor works of medicine and geography. Legendary and actual history, and chronicles, in verse and in prose, are numerous. But works of imagination are not lacking: *fabliaux*, *lais*, *disputes*, and the longer chivalric romances are also among Anglo-Norman productions. This is only a reminder of some of the varied interests of Anglo-Norman literature, for the subject was attractively treated by Professor Walberg in recent lectures,<sup>2</sup> and the purpose here is rather to outline the course of Anglo-Norman studies than to describe the Anglo-Norman language and literature.

## 2

It is nearly a century and half since the Abbé de La Rue, Royal Professor of History in the University of Caen, addressed Epistolary Dissertations upon the Lives and Writings of Robert Wace and various [other] Anglo-Norman Poets of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to individual members of the Society of Antiquaries.<sup>3</sup> In 1818 Francis Cohen (who became Sir Francis Palgrave) published four short Anglo-Norman poems from a Harleian manuscript.<sup>4</sup> Somewhat later, the Abbé de La Rue published his *Essais historiques sur les bardes, les jongleurs, et les trouvères normands et anglo-normands* (Caen, 1834). Following these, Michel,<sup>5</sup> Leroux de Lincy,<sup>6</sup> Jubinal,<sup>7</sup> Wright<sup>8</sup> and Halliwell<sup>9</sup>

2. *Infra*, note 52.

3. English translations of the letters were published under these titles in *Archaeologia*, XII and XIII (1796, 1800).

4. The work has no general title-page; it is described at length by H. L. D. Ward in *Catalogue of Romances* (London, 1883), I, 815; and in the *Brit. Mus. Catal. of Printed Books*. It was printed by Bulmer at London, in-4°. The four poems are from Harl. MS 2253 and are the items numbered by Vising, 371, 268, 221, 245 (printed in that order). The editor prefixed a prologue to each, the first one beginning: *Cy ensuyt une chanson moult pitoyable*. . . .

5. Francisque Michel: many titles, 1834-86.

6. A. J. V. LeRoux de Lincy, *Les Quatre Livres des Rois traduits en français du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1841 (Collection des documents inédits . . . 2<sup>e</sup> série); *Recueil de chants historiques français*, 1<sup>e</sup> série, Paris, 1841.

7. Achille Jubinal, *Nouveau Recueil de contes . . . des XIII<sup>e</sup>, XIV<sup>e</sup> et XV<sup>e</sup> siècles*, 2

printed other texts of various *genres*, and the Rolls Series included a number of Anglo-Norman texts of historical or documentary character.<sup>10</sup> While these early publications were valuable in so far as they drew attention to Anglo-Norman literature, they were not linguistic studies, nor were they often critical texts. The first linguistic study was to come from Ireland.

In 1876 Professor R. Atkinson of Dublin published the thirteenth-century Anglo-Norman *Life of St. Alban*, attributed to Matthew Paris, of which the sole surviving manuscript is in Dublin.<sup>11</sup> Hermann Suchier supplemented this edition, in the same year, with a sixty-page brochure in which he presented certain Anglo-Norman vowel-changes in chronological order and listed the less-known Anglo-Norman poetical works of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in chronological groups. In a detailed discussion of syllable-values in the *St. Auban*, Suchier launched his theory of the "Auftakt" and the influence of English rhythm on Anglo-Norman versification.<sup>12</sup>

Meanwhile, Gaston Paris and Paul Meyer had founded *Romania* in 1872, where Paul Meyer was already publishing the results of his examination of French manuscripts in England.<sup>13</sup> Gaston Paris reviewed the work of both Atkinson and Suchier and stated the general formula for Anglo-Norman versification as conceived by the French school: the Anglo-Norman poets meant to follow French verse-forms, but did not know the rules well enough and used pronunciations different from the Continental French.<sup>14</sup> The French position is supported by the fact that similar irregularities are found in the efforts of medieval Italians to write French verse. Koch's edition of Chardry in 1879 took up the Ger-

vols., Paris, 1839-42; possibly by him is an anonymous edition of *Le Sermon de Guichard de Beaulieu* . . . , Paris, Techener & Silvestre, 1834.

8. Thomas Wright: many titles, 1837-73.

9. Wright and J. O. Halliwell, *Reliquiae antiquae*, 2 vols., London, 1841-43.

10. *Rerum britannicarum mediæ ævi Scriptores*, London: (3) H. R. Luard, *Lives of Edward the Confessor*. §I. *La Estoire de Saint Aedward le Rei*, 1858; (31) A. J. Horwood and L. O. Pike, *Year Books of the Reign of Edward the First*, and *Year Books of the Reign of Edward the Third*, 1863-1911; (42) J. Glover, *Le livre de reis de Brittanie e le livre de reis de Engleterre*, 1865; (47) T. Wright, *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft in French Verse* . . . 1866, 1868; (85) J. B. Sheppard, *Litterae Cantuarienses. The Letter-Books of the Monastery of Christ Church Canterbury*, 1887-89.

11. R. Atkinson, *Vie de Saint Auban: a Poem in Norman-French*, etc., London, 1876, from MS E. I. 40 in Trinity College, Dublin.

12. H. Suchier, *Ueber die Matthäus Paris zugeschriebene Vie de Saint Auban*, Halle, 1876.

13. A bibliography of the works of Gaston Paris was published by Joseph Bédier and Mario Roques at Paris in 1904. I have in preparation a critical bibliography of the works of Paul Meyer.

14. *R.*, v (1876), 384-389, vi (1877), 145.

manic position.<sup>15</sup> Reviews and rejoinders carried the discussion on for several years.

The earliest surviving Anglo-Norman text was edited by E. Mall in 1873: *Li Cumpoz Philipe de Thaïn* (Strassburg), having been first printed by Thomas Wright in 1841 as *Livre des Creatures*.<sup>16</sup> In 1882 appeared the first publication of the scholar to whom, with Paul Meyer, Anglo-Norman studies owe perhaps the most extensive contributions. Johan Vising's dissertation on the Anglo-Norman dialect in the twelfth century made the first effort to establish a definitely dated basis for studying the development of the language. He narrowed the field to those texts which could be dated by internal evidence and controlled by reason of being in verse and existing in more than one manuscript.<sup>17</sup> Two years later Stürzinger's edition of the *Orthographia Gallica* gave some material for the later thirteenth century,<sup>18</sup> and in 1887 Busch's dissertation presented the phonology and morphology of fourteenth-century Anglo-Norman.<sup>19</sup>

Vising soon followed his study of the dialect by one of Anglo-Norman versification. He denied English influence and joined Tobler and the French school in calling the basis syllabic. He attributed faulty verses to scribes, to alteration in the number of syllables of French words in England, and to the ignorance or carelessness of authors.<sup>20</sup> Suchier in time modified his theory of a special Anglo-Norman prosody. By 1884 he had abandoned the "Auftakt" and later characterized the versification as well as the language as a complete breakdown.<sup>21</sup>

Paul Meyer continued for many decades to publish the fruits of his study of French manuscripts in England, articles which added frequently to the sum of Anglo-Norman information.<sup>22</sup> Gaston Paris included some account of Anglo-Norman literature in his various books on medieval French literature and poetry,<sup>23</sup> as did also Suchier in his his-

15. J. Koch, *Chardry's Josaphaz, Set Dormanz und Petit Plet* (Altfranzösische Bibliothek, I), Heilbronn, 1870.

16. In *Popular Treatises on Science, etc.*, pp. 20 ff.

17. Johan Vising, *Etude sur le dialecte anglo-normand du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Upsala, 1882.

18. J. Stürzinger, *Orthographia gallica* (Altfranz. Bibl., VIII), Heilbronn, 1884.

19. E. Busch, *Laut- und Formenlehre der anglonormannischen Sprache des XIV. Jahrhunderts . . .*, Greifswald, 1887.

20. *Sur la versification anglo-normande*, Upsala, 1884.

21. *Medium Aevum*, III (1934), 220.

22. In *Romania, Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits . . .*, *Bulletin de la Société des Anciens Textes Français, Histoire Littéraire de la France*, etc.

23. *La Poésie de moyen âge*, 2<sup>e</sup> série, Paris, 1895; *Manuel d'ancien français: La Littérature française au moyen âge . . .*, Paris, 1888, 1890, 1905. He also wrote on "Wilham de Wadington, auteur du *Manuel des Péchés*" in *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, XXVIII (1881), 179-207.

tory of medieval French literature.<sup>24</sup> Stimming's edition of *Boeve de Haumtone* in 1899 is a landmark in Anglo-Norman studies for its masterly detailed examination of a single text.<sup>25</sup> In the eighties, critical editions of several Anglo-Norman texts appeared in the *Société des Anciens Textes Français*, by Gaston Paris and Paul Meyer, with collaborators.<sup>26</sup> But so many of the serious studies of Anglo-Norman texts which appeared at intervals during the last quarter of the nineteenth century were by Germans or Scandinavians that in 1900 Vising felt constrained to close his lecture before the International Historical Congress with a plea to Frenchmen to take up this neglected study of Anglo-Norman, a study which, even across the Channel, was closer to them in fact and in spirit than to the Nordics.<sup>27</sup>

There was little noticeable French response in succeeding years, beyond Bédier's editions of the *Tristan* of Thomas and *La Folie Tristan*,<sup>28</sup> but the Scandinavian production increased under Vising's direction, and presently England and America entered the field. From Harvard came W. H. Schofield's *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer* (1906), which gave a survey of the Anglo-Norman contribution. In 1903, Professor Maitland began supplying valuable material in the *Year Books of Edward II*; in the first volume he wrote an interesting chapter on their language.<sup>29</sup> The Selden society is still continuing these publications and Miss Legge has made further linguistic comments in the two latest volumes on which she collaborated with Sir William Holdsworth.<sup>30</sup> The *Year Books of Henry III and Edward I* were published in the *Rolls Series*<sup>31</sup> and the *Year Books of Richard II* are being

24. H. Suchier and A. Birch-Hirschfeld, *Geschichte der französischen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart*, Leipzig and Vienna, 1900; 2nd ed. in 2 vols., the first vol. on the medieval period (by Suchier), 1913.

25. A. Stimming, *Der anglonormannische Boeve de Haumtone* (Bibliotheca normannica, VII) Halle, 1899.

26. G. Paris and A. Bos, *Vie de S. Gilles*, Paris, 1881, and *Trois Versions de l'Evangile de Nicodème*, Paris, 1885; P. Meyer, *Fragments d'une vie de S. Thomas de Cantorbéry . . .*, Paris, 1885; L. Toulmin Smith and P. Meyer, *Les Contes moralisés de Nicole Bozon*, Paris, 1889.

27. "Le Français en Angleterre. Mémoire sur les études de l'anglo-normand" in *Annales Internationales d'Histoire*, Paris, 1901, pp. 43-48.

28. *Société des Anciens Textes Français*, 1902-05 and 1907. Cf. A. E. Curdy, *La Folie Tristan. An Anglo-Norman Poem*. Part I, Baltimore, 1903.

29. F. W. Maitland, "Of the Anglo-French Language in the Early Year Books" in *Year Books of Edward II*, I (London, 1903), xxxiii-lxxxi (Selden Society Publications, XVII); part reprinted in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, I (Cambridge 1907), 407-412.

30. *Year Books of Edward II*, XX (1934), xxx-xlii; XXI (1935), xxxviii-xliv (Selden Society Publications, LII, LIV).

31. *Supra*, note 10.



brought out by the Ames Foundation at Harvard,<sup>32</sup> but neither of these series has given any special attention to linguistic study. The Year Books are informal, almost verbatim, records of law cases made by lawyers for their own information and for the instruction of their juniors. Although their special legal vocabulary may not be of great interest for literature or for formal language, they do give us also the living vernacular of backchat, courtroom asides, and the private comments of the men who made these records.

In his review of Vising's *Versification*, Paul Meyer pointed out that Frère Angier of Oxford had left at least one certain basis for language study, for in the manuscript of his work scribe and author are one, and the manuscript is dated 1212-1214, as well as placed at Oxford.<sup>33</sup> In 1903, Miss M. K. Pope published a careful study of the language of Angier's poems,<sup>34</sup> and in 1910, having always kept a sharp eye on dialects, she showed that the *Life of the Black Prince* was of Continental rather than Insular origin.<sup>35</sup>

After the studies of separate centuries in the eighties, the next synthesis was the grammar of *The Anglo-Norman Dialect* by Professor L. E. Menger of Bryn Mawr, published posthumously in 1904 (New York and London). This did not pretend to be original investigation: Menger's aim was to organize the available material into a form suitable to guide students using original editions of texts with their accompanying linguistic studies.

A professorship in Southampton led Paul Studer to the study of the Oak Book and the Port Books,<sup>36</sup> and this study brought him into the ranks of specialists in the Anglo-Norman field. He edited the *Mystère d'Adam* in 1918,<sup>37</sup> and, with Miss Joan Evans, *Anglo-Norman Lapidaries* in 1924 (Paris). Being appointed to the Taylorian professorship of the Romance Languages at Oxford, he made "The Study of Anglo-Norman" the subject of his inaugural lecture: he opened with a discussion of the terms Anglo-French and Anglo-Norman, urged the ap-

32. G. F. Deiser and T. F. T. Plucknett, *Year Books of Richard II*, Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1914, etc. (in progress: 3rd vol., 1937).

33. *R*, xv (1886), 144-148; edition of Angier's work by P. Meyer in *R*, xii (1883), 145-208.

34. *Etude sur la langue de Frère Angier* . . . Thèse, Paris, 1903; also, Oxford and Paris, [1904] (same edition, with new title-page).

35. M. K. Pope and E. C. Lodge, *Life of the Black Prince by the Herald of Sir John Chandos*, Oxford, 1910.

36. *The Oak Book of Southampton*, 2 vols. and Supplement, Southampton, 1910-11 (Publ. of the Southampton Record Soc., x-xii); the Supplement contains 50 pages of "Notes on the Anglo-French (or Anglo-Norman) dialect of Southampton in the beginning of the fourteenth century." *The Port Books of Southampton*, Southampton, 1913 (Publ. S.R.S., xv).

37. Manchester, etc.



propriateness of Anglo-Norman studies in England, and indicated the various kinds of work needed in this field.<sup>38</sup>

Editions of texts and dissertations on individual questions have continued to accumulate in the twentieth century. In 1915 appeared in Paris a work monumental in its undertaking: *L'Evolution du verbe en anglo-français, XIII<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles*, by F. J. Tanqueray. The author used manuscripts as well as printed sources, and prose and non-literary works as well as poetry for his investigation. His method involved disadvantages which to a certain extent lessen the profit of the greater amount of material he made available. Some of his datings must inevitably be questioned,<sup>39</sup> and it is not always clear when a given trait may be relied on as phonological and when it must be considered as possibly, or even probably, only a question of spelling. The failure to make this distinction unfortunately vitiates many studies, as Miss Pope has recently pointed out.<sup>40</sup> Nevertheless, provided these precautions are kept in mind, one may find a great amount of useful material assembled in Professor Tanqueray's study. The fruitful discussion which it might have aroused in journals was apparently impeded by the war: reviews of it are few and negligible. His complementary thesis, an edition of Anglo-Norman letters, appeared in the following year.<sup>41</sup> Since the war he has published a few short Anglo-Norman texts, reviving in his introduction the discussion of Anglo-Norman prosody on questions of syllable-count, verse-length, and cesura.<sup>42</sup>

In 1917 and 1918, in America, Miss Hope Emily Allen pointed out, in several articles, the literary significance of Anglo-Norman,—its continuity with Middle English literature.<sup>43</sup> The insular French literature which has been accused of being mainly imitative includes a considerable body of religious verse, which, so far from being imitative of French models, has no parallel in French literature of the time, and in fact leads up to the mystical English verse of the fourteenth century. In a number of cases Miss Allen has found Anglo-Norman sources for

38. Published at Oxford in 1920, having been delivered on Feb. 6 of that year; he was appointed in 1913, but the war and ill-health delayed the delivery of his inaugural lecture.

39. For instance, Prof. Waters pointed out two fundamental errors in his use of the *Brendan*: he did not take account of the thirteenth-century Picard reworking of the original A-N text in MS A (Cotton Vesp. B X), and he dated this MS a century too early: Waters, *Brendan* (full title *infra*, note 44), p. clxviii, note 4.

40. *From Latin to Modern French*, §1080 (full title *infra*, note 53).

41. *Recueil de lettres anglo-françaises (1265-1399)*, Paris, 1916.

42. *Plaintes de la Vierge en anglo-français (XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, Paris, 1921; *Deux Poèmes moraux anglo-français . . .*, Paris, 1922.

43. *MP*, XIII (1915-16), 741-745; XIV (1916-17), 255-256, 757-758; *RR*, VIII (1917), 434-462; IX (1918), 154-193.

Middle English works. She also suggested the study of concurrent metres in the versification of all three languages in use in medieval England. Tanqueray made such a study, but to a limited extent, in his 1921 edition of the *Plainte d'Amour*. The war seems to have limited the notice taken of Miss Allen's observations, also. At the 1934 meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, a paper was read from Miss Allen, again urging the importance of studying the two literatures side by side and of getting more Anglo-Norman texts adequately and accessibly edited for this purpose. Medieval ecclesiastical ordinances for the instruction of the laity called forth works in Anglo-Norman which have not been sufficiently studied. They are important for the understanding of the English spirit and its literary expression. Paul Meyer had planned to publish a study of Anglo-Norman didactic literature, but died before it was ready. The connection of Bishop Grosseteste's name with popular religious poetry may prove to have been an important influence in the Anglo-Norman literature of the thirteenth century. Miss Allen based her comment on this point upon the contents of certain well-known manuscripts. I have in preparation an edition of the unpublished Anglo-Norman versions of Grosseteste's works which may throw more light on Miss Allen's conjecture.

Professor E. G. R. Waters' work in Anglo-Norman<sup>44</sup> succeeded Studer's, and studies in the same subject continue in Oxford with the work of Professor A. Ewert<sup>45</sup> and his students. In Cambridge, Professor O. H. Prior edited the first volume of *Cambridge Anglo-Norman Texts* for the Cambridge Anglo-Norman Text Society in 1924. Prior felt strongly that insufficient weight was given to the possibility of English influence in both phonology and verse-forms, particularly in the light of advances in English studies.<sup>46</sup> From London have come texts and studies by Professor L. M. Brandin, who also contributed the article on Anglo-Norman literature to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.<sup>47</sup> To the late Professor A. T. Baker of Sheffield we are indebted for a number of editions of Anglo-Norman texts, especially editions of lives of saints.<sup>48</sup>

44. *The Anglo-Norman Voyage of St. Benedict* . . . , Oxford, 1928.

45. *Gui de Warewic* (Classiques Français du Moyen Age), 2 vols., Paris, 1933; and articles.

46. *R*, XLIX (1923), 161-185; and Preface to *Cambridge Anglo-Norman Texts*, 1924.

47. *Introduction to Fulk Fitz Warine*, London, 1904; "Un Fragment de la Vie de S. Gilles" in *R*, XXXIII (1904), 94-98; *Fouke Fitzwarin* (Classiques Français du Moyen Age), Paris, 1930, etc.; *Enc. Brit.* 11th ed., revised in 14th; and others in *Mélanges E. Picot* (1913), *Mélanges* . . . A. Thomas (1927), *Mélanges* . . . A. Jeanroy (1928), *Miscellany* . . . Kastner (1932).

48. *Modern Language Review*, VI (1911), 476-502; VII (1912), 74-93, 157-192; *R*, LV (1929) 332-381; *Miscellany* . . . Kastner, Cambridge, 1932, pp. 9-21, etc.

In 1923 Vising brought up to date and made accessible in English his studies in various branches of Anglo-Norman which had previously been published in French, German and Swedish.<sup>49</sup> With these chapters he published a succinct catalogue of Anglo-Norman literature, an essential bibliography and an index to manuscripts, to the everlasting gratitude of all who have since worked in the Anglo-Norman field.<sup>50</sup>

Although Professor Vising has retired and confines his publication to short articles and reviews, we still have Anglo-Norman studies from Sweden. Professor Hilding Kjellman's study of versification and language in the twelfth-century *St. Edmund* has received favorable comment; the glossary to this edition is of special importance, since the text was not used by Godefroy.<sup>51</sup> To syntheses we add the three lectures Professor Walberg gave at the Ecole des Chartes in 1935 and published the following year.<sup>52</sup>

The most important recent publication in Anglo-Norman studies is the section devoted to Anglo-Norman in the new grammar by Miss Pope, now Professor in the University of Manchester.<sup>53</sup> She has here synthesized with her prolonged studies of dialects not only the accumulation of edited texts but also the many scattered articles which have been published on points of detail. The work is limited to phonology and morphology. The phonetic principles of all sound-changes are carefully examined and spelling is differentiated from pronunciation. This is, I believe, the first special study of Anglo-Norman orthography, though Stimming and Waters added to their editions an appendix on the spelling of the text under consideration, and Menger gave orthographical variants in his discussion of phonology.<sup>54</sup> Tanqueray pointed out to the French in 1915 that Anglo-Norman would not be more barbarously different from French than several of the Continental dialects but for its spelling.<sup>55</sup>

49. A bibliography of Vising's works was published by J. Borsgård in *Mélanges . . . Vising* (Gothenburg and Paris, 1925), pp. 389-419.

50. *Anglo-Norman Language and Literature*, London, 1923 (Oxford Lang. and Lit. Series).

51. *La Vie Seint Edmund le Rei*, Gothenburg, 1935 (Göteborgs Kungl. Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhälles Handlingar. Femte Följden. Ser. A. Band. 4. N:o 3).

52. E. Walberg, *Quelques Aspects de la littérature anglo-normande*, Paris, 1936.

53. *From Latin to Modern French with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman: Phonology and Morphology*, Manchester, 1934 (Publications of the Univ. of Manchester, CCXXIX).

54. *Supra*, p. 8 and notes 25 and 39.

55. *L'Évolution du verbe . . .*, p. 861. Professor Pope gives an example of nine different spellings for one monosyllabic word, eight of which may also function for a homonym from another Latin form (*From Latin to Modern French*, p. 461).

## 3

The foregoing summary does not pretend to have touched on all Anglo-Norman studies, nor even to have mentioned all the important ones, and it has named only a few of many workers in the field. Chronological and critical bibliography can be found without difficulty.<sup>56</sup> The aim has been, by tracing the course of Anglo-Norman studies, to show the need and scope of future work.

The Anglo-Norman Text Society has now taken shape. It will, as its name implies, sponsor the publication of Anglo-Norman texts, while the Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and Literature, with its journal *Medium Aevum* and the new *Medium Aevum Monographs*, will include in its scope the more general aspects of Anglo-Norman, such as Dr. C. B. West's study of *Courtoisie in Anglo-Norman Literature*, which has recently appeared.

Editions of several historical works and of at least two saints' lives are in progress; work is being done on the *Secret des Secrets*, the *Manuel des Péchés*, and the *Petite Philosophie*. Miss M. D. Legge is editing an Anglo-Norman Epistolary from an All Souls' College manuscript, and Miss J. Nicholson is studying Anglo-Norman lyrics. Professor C. H. Livingston of Bowdoin is editing an Anglo-Norman Nominale, and Miss Pope's edition of *Horn* is nearing completion.<sup>57</sup> Professor Brandin edited *La Destruction de Rome* and *Fierabras* from Egerton MS 3028 in volume LXIV (1938) of *Romania*. Professor Ewert is supervising the Anglo-Norman part of Professor Roques' glossary project. Mr. J. A. Herbert has accomplished the difficult transcription of the Anglo-Norman text of *Ancren Riwele* contained in the badly burned Cottonian MS Vitellius F.VII,<sup>58</sup> and is editing it for the Early English Text Society. Further study is also projected of another Anglo-Norman MS, containing portions of *Ancren Riwele*, recently discovered by Miss Allen.<sup>59</sup> This is some of the more important work now being done. Professor Ewert recently published in *Medium Aevum* (VII (1938), pp. 164-166) as complete a list as possible of Anglo-Norman studies in progress. He would be glad to be informed of any projects as they are

56. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vising, Pope, etc.

57. *La Petite Philosophie*, edited by Professor W. H. Trethewey of Toronto University, is announced as the Anglo-Norman Text Society's volume for 1938. The text for 1939 will be *Li Livre des Seintes Medecines* edited by E. J. Arnould of London University. Miss Legge's edition is to appear in 1940 and Professor Pope's in 1941. Ivor Arnold of Belfast is using an Anglo-Norman MS in his forthcoming edition of Wace's *Brut*.

58. Cf. G. C. Macaulay, in *Modern Language Review*, IX (1914), 64 ff.

59. See her letter in the *Times Literary Supplement*, London, Oct. 24, 1936, p. 863.

undertaken in order to make this list more useful and to help avoid duplication of work in the field.

Many textual studies are still needed as the foundation of both literary and linguistic work. Professor Pope herself says: "Much spade work remains to be done before the course of development can be accurately determined."<sup>60</sup> The domains of Insular and Continental composition need more strict definition—such work as Misses Pope and Lodge did in *The Black Prince* and Professor I. C. Lecompte in *Le Roman des Romans* (Princeton and Paris, 1923. Elliott Monographs, 14). The prosody is not yet a closed question: continued study of texts may bring up fresh material for one phase or another, as Dr. F. B. Agard has recently found. An Anglo-Norman dictionary is an important desideratum. Professor Pope's grammar did not take up syntax or semantics. Scholars in both Anglo-Norman and Middle English have pointed to the relation between these two fields: these literary and linguistic relations call for further investigation.

Most of the Anglo-Norman texts which have been edited are of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; the fourteenth century is still a largely unworked field in Anglo-Norman. As was implied earlier in this article, a number of texts published in the nineteenth century need to be re-edited by the canons of modern scholarship; and reprints are wanted of limited and inaccessible editions. Visings's *Anglo-Norman Language and Literature* indicates whether works have been completely or partially edited, when, and by whom. Besides the works of literary interest, many of the still unedited texts are of a technical nature (dealing with falconry, hunting, etc.) and would therefore yield valuable material for both lexicography and the study of Middle English.

Another problem still unsolved is whether variations in Anglo-Norman are regional or individual. Suchier distinguished northern from southern texts by the differing sounds of the vowel *u*. Busch, Meyer-Lübke, and Studer have also found regional distinctions in Anglo-Norman. The general opinion has been, however, that most variations in Anglo-Norman are to be attributed to the education and background of individuals and to their more or less frequent contact with Continental French, rather than to regional characteristics. Prior felt that this question might well be reopened and considered in the light of more advanced knowledge of Middle English phonology. It would be assisted by more intensive study of Anglo-Norman letters, since both the date and the provenance of correspondence can usually be determined closely.

60. *From Latin to Modern French*, § 1080.

A continuation of the late Professor R. E. Zachrisson's study of Anglo-Norman place-names<sup>61</sup> would contribute further to the question of regional variations in Anglo-Norman. As paleographical knowledge and judgment improve, it becomes increasingly possible to localize scripts regionally as well as chronologically: such study may well throw new light on Anglo-Norman in time and place. Some of us are in fact working on the paleography of Anglo-Norman manuscripts to see if that study may yield any criteria for dating or placing composition and language. As a by-product of such an examination of Anglo-Norman manuscripts I am preparing an index of *incipits* of Anglo-Norman works and a more complete index of Anglo-Norman manuscripts than lay within the scope of Vising's manual. It will be many years before anyone's work will supersede his invaluable summary, which indicates our materials and outlines the field of our work. In Anglo-Norman there is a challenging field which is still in no danger of being overworked. It is to be hoped that many will join us.

RUTH J. DEAN

*Mount Holyoke College*

61. *A Contribution to the Study of the Anglo-Norman Influence on English Place-names*, Lund, 1909 (with bibliography); *Modern Language Review*, xii (1917), 146; Chap. v: "The French Element" in A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, *Introduction to the Survey of English Place-names*, Cambridge, 1924 (English Place-name Society, I, 1), pp. 93-114.



## DANTE NOTES

---

### "STORPIO"

(*Purg.*, xxv, 1)

THE CHOICE of an *interpretatio difficilior*, from among two or more possibilities, must have really good grounds before it can be justified. This is the reason why I am puzzled at the practical unanimity with which the commentators, especially the Italian commentators, insist that "storpio," in *Purg.*, xxv, 1, means "impediment," and does not mean "cripple." The verse reads: "Ora era onde 'l salir non volea *storpio*." The real difficulty, in my humble opinion, lies in the word "onde"; and inasmuch as the climbers had just been introduced into this steep and narrow path to the next higher round of the Mount of Purgatory, and the time was along toward two o'clock in the afternoon, I think the best interpretation would probably be to take *onde* in its primary meaning of "whence," "from which (on)," "after which," and to translate: "It was an [advanced] hour [, and one, to start] from which, the mounting wished no cripple": *i.e.* would have called for any one else than, would have been unsuited for, a cripple. Poletto, one of the few supporters of the meaning "cripple," adduces in confirmation of his stand *Inf.*, xxiv, 31, "It was no way for one dressed in a cloak"—with particular reference to the leaden cloaks of the hypocrites in the *bolgia* the Poets were just leaving—; and adds: "so here, to tell us that the way was long and the available time short, [the Poet] declares that it was no enterprise for lame persons."<sup>1</sup> This is not a bad point; but still better would have been to compare *Purg.*, iv, 31-33: "Noi salivam per entro il sasso rotto, . . . e piedi e man *volea* il suol di sotto"—"We were mounting within the cleft rock, . . . and feet and hands the footing beneath *was wishing*": a similar experience; and exactly the same verb, in the same tense. With all this before us, it is natural to think that, in our passage, the ascent is represented, by a quasi-personification, as "wishing no cripple"—rather than "no obstacle." *Storpio* means "cripple," as well as "impediment," "hindrance"; and until it can be proved that the word

1. D. G. Poletto, *Dizionario dantesco* (7 vols.); vol. 6 (Siena 1887); s.v. *Storpio*: ". . . aggettivo, il contrario di *lesto*, di *gambe pronte* (cf. *Purg.*, iii, 48). Come altrove, per dirne l'arduità dell'ascendere di *chiappa* in *chiappa*, per uscire dalla *bolgia* degli ipocriti, dichiara che quella 'Non era via da vestito di cappa,' *Inf.*, xxiv, 31, . . . così qui per dirne che la via era lunga e poco il tempo concesso, dichiara che non era impresa da zoppi."

was *not* used in the former sense in Dante's time, I shall continue to feel that "cripple" is what Dante meant here.

Taking the meaning as "cripple" we may perhaps find also an especial fitness in the characterization of the steep and narrow passageway, a few verses later. After speaking, in the second *terzina*, of the eager haste with which they attacked the ascent, the Poet goes on to say, vss. 7-9: "thus we entered through the gap, one before the other taking the stair which because of its narrowness *un-pairs* the climbers."<sup>2</sup> A cripple would therefore have not only the natural difficulty due to his infirmity, but would also be handicapped through not being able to walk beside those who might aid him.

Even if *storpio*, as adjective or noun, in the sense of "cripple(d)" did not exist in Dante's day (which I do not think can ever be demonstrated), *of* if—as is probable—it was much less used in that sense than later: it is not likely that he would have hesitated to employ it, as a variant of *storpiato*—which he uses once.<sup>3</sup> It made a neat rhyme with "*Scorpio*": the only rhyme in *-orpio* in the entire Poem. Italian has always possessed a large number of these shorter forms which seem like abbreviated replicas of their congeneric participles in *-ato*, and are indeed often called "syncopated participles." Dante's works themselves contain many of them. In the case of half a dozen, out of about a score that I have noted (I lay no claims to my list's being complete), we find him using both members of the pair.<sup>4</sup> In one case, at least (there may be more), it looks very much as if he had deliberately "syncopated" a participle to get a rhyme: "*urto*," for *urtato*, *Inf.*, xxvi, 45, rhyming with *furto* and *surto*—and forming the third of the only triad in *-urto* in the *Divine Comedy*—is registered only for this passage, in the Tommaseo-Bellini *Dictionary*.

Much more cogent arguments will have to be brought to bear than the solidarity of the Italian commentators, including the practical unanimity of the earliest,<sup>5</sup> before I shall believe that by "storpio" Dante

2. "così entrammo noi per la callaia, uno innanzi altro prendendo la scala/che per artezza i salitor dispaia."

3. *Inf.*, xxviii, 31: "Vedi come storpiato è Maometto!"

4. *adorno, adornato; carco, carcato; chino, chinato; queto, quietato; tocco, toccato; uso, usato*; perhaps *conto* (*Inf.*, x, 39), *contato* (*Conv.*, ii, xiv, 14).

5. Scartazzini's note, Leipzig ed., 1875, said that "tutti gli antichi ad eccezione dell'Imolese"—as well as all the modern commentators—explained "storpio" here as meaning "impaccio, impedimento, indugio," and quotes "Benv. Ramb." in Italian, viz.: "*Ora era tanto tarda che non ci volea uno storpio delle gambe per salir là con quella fretta e prestezza che richiedevasi.*" But, Benvenuto's Latin (Vernon ed., Florence, Barbèra, 1887, iv, 91) reads: ". . . *non volea storpio*, idest, impedimentum, imo potius festinantiam, quia erat inter meridiem et vespas."



meant "impediment," "hindrance," in *Purg.*, xxv, 1, rather than "cripple."

"THE FEET THAT SUFFERED"

(*Par.*, xx, 105)

Dante's reference to the conversion of Ripheus and Trajan, respectively, by mention of their faith in "the feet that were to suffer and those which had suffered," is in harmony with that concept of Man's upward climb along the Way of Truth and Life which is foreshadowed in the very first *terzina* of the *Divine Comedy*, and is developed with especial concreteness in its own context of the pilgrim's final entrance into the Eternal City;<sup>6</sup> and it is also in conformity with the Biblical, that is, essentially Hebrew, habit of mentioning human actions by reference to the particular part of the body involved, and, specifically, of mentioning *feet* in connection with references to forerunners and followers of Christ: best known of all is the figure in *Isaiah*, lii, 7: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings," etc.<sup>7</sup>

Dante's own use of the identical type of expression in a number of passages seems to be only another indication of the thoroughness with which he was imbued with the spirit, and the very imagery, and even diction, of his forerunners, the Scriptural prophets. In *Par.*, xi, 80, he says that to follow the admirable example of St. Francis, the venerable Bernard "si scalzò prima," "was the first to take off his shoes," and "after so great peace ran";<sup>8</sup> in xii, 116, is deplored the defection of Dominic's order which had been proceeding rightly "coi piedi alle sue orme," "with their feet in his footprints"; and in xxii, 73 f., St. Benedict complains that, to mount up Jacob's Ladder to Heaven, "now no one moves From earth his feet."<sup>9</sup>

With these references to feet may be paralleled Dante's choice of "palma" in *Par.*, ix, 123, to refer to Christ's passion, because he is pair-

6. Cf., esp., *Par.*, xxiii, 38 f.—The text of *Par.*, xx, 103-105 is: "De' corpi suoi non uscir come credi/gentili, ma cristiani, in ferma fede/quel de' passuri e quel de' passi piedi." The immediately following verses, 106-107, bear words suggestive of traveling: "Chè l'una dello 'nferno, u' non si riede/gia mai a buon voler, tornò all'ossa."—A good Biblical parallel to the concept is 1 Peter, ii, 21: "... : because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps" (*Vulg.*: "... : quia et Christus passus est pro nobis, vobis relinquens exemplum, ut sequamini vestigia ejus").

7. Cf. *Nahum*, i, 15 (quoted also by Jerome, *Paulino*, vii; and in *Romans*, x, 15).

8. Vss. 80 f.: "... dietro a tanta pace/corse ..."—cf. the "peace" of the Biblical quotation just cited: this may be a, conscious or unconscious, echo. In vs. 83, also: "Scalzasi Egidio, scalzasi Silvestro."

9. "Ma, per salirli, mo nessun diparte/da terra i piedi. . ."

ing it with that other victory won over Jericho by Joshua, that other Jesus, by the "lifting up of his *hands*," that is "palms."<sup>10</sup>

#### HATS, HOODS AND COWLFULS

The figure in *Par.* XXI, 126, where Peter Damian characterizes the cardinal's hat as one which "pur di male in peggio si travasa," "which ever (or 'only') from bad to worse is poured," is none too clear, at first sight. *Travasare*, to "transfer from one vessel to another," is normally used to refer to the pouring of liquids, especially wine,<sup>11</sup> from one (usually large) container to another: and it seems odd that it should be applied here to the transfer of the cardinal's hat from one head to the next—a hat suggesting itself as a container, rather than as the thing that is transferred from container to container—especially when in the very next verse the metaphor of the "vessel" of the Holy Spirit is chosen to represent St. Paul: *in* whom, certainly, was the Spirit; so that the figure there is perfectly natural.

But when, in the next canto, we find St. Benedict referring to the cowls of the backsliding monks of his Order as "sacca . . . piene di farina ria," "sacks full of bad flour,"<sup>12</sup> it begins to look as if Dante, though really meaning the cardinal's hat which went from each bad wearer to the next and worse, was *thinking* rather of the ever increasing rottenness that went into each successive cardinal's hat, and was visualizing something like a hatful, or cowlful, of filthy rubbish.

Now one might still remain very skeptical. But, seven cantos later, comes another metaphor of a filthy hoodful: Beatrice, in scorn of the modern preachers who prefer raising a laugh to preaching the Gospel, says that "provided there is a good laugh, the hood swells, and nothing better is asked; but such a bird is nesting in the peak, that if the crowd saw it they would know how much confidence to have in their indulgences."<sup>13</sup> The "bird" is a devil, who, as has well been glossed by

10. *Ecclus.*, XLVI, 3: "Quam gloriam adeptus est in tollendo manus suas."—Joshua is the same name as Jesus, and the O. T. character is often referred to in the *Vulgate* as Jesus son of Nun, or Nave; e.g., in the 1st vs. of the chap. of *Ecclus.* just mentioned: "Fortis in bello Jesus Nave . . ."

11. In *Jer.*, XLVIII, 11, which is often quoted as a parallel to *Purg.*, VII, 117 ("ben andava il valor di vaso in vaso"), the context shows that wine was intended: "Fertilis fuit Moab ab adolescentia sua et requievit in faecibus suis: nec transfusus est de vase in vas, et in transmigrationem non abiit: idcirco permansit gustus ejus in eo, et odor ejus non est immutatus."

12. *Par.*, XXII, 78.

13. *Par.* XXIX, 116-120: ". . . pur che ben si rida, / gonfia il cappuccio, e più non si richiede. / Ma tale uccel nel becchetto s' annida, / che se 'l vulgo il vedesse, vederebbe / la perdonanza di ch' el si confida."

a reference to *Inf.*, xxvii, 117,<sup>14</sup> has long "been at his locks," ready to drag him off by them to Hell when his time should come. Birds' nests, at best, are not noted for cleanness; and much less so, devil-birds' nests.<sup>15</sup>

An evil odor of very similar nature seems to lurk also in Brunetto Latini's arraignment of the base Florentines, whose city is the "plant of Satan," when he exclaims, in *Inf.*, xv, 73-78: "let the Fiesolan creatures (*bestie*; apparently foul and quarrelsome *birds*) make litter of themselves, and not touch the plant, if any still rises in their dungyard, in which lives again the holy seed of those Romans who remained there when it was made the *nest* of so much wickedness."

With these metaphors may be grouped a couple of others, where the verbs have a suggestion of cleaning grain, or the like, which becomes heightened by the fact that in both cases the same adjective *reo* (*rio*) is used as in the clause of *Par.*, xxii, 78 ("the cowls are sacks full of *bad* flour"), which gave us our first real clue. In *Purg.*, xiii, 107, Sapia says: "rimondo<sup>16</sup> qui la vita *ria*," "I clean here my bad life," which is probably a figure of this type; and, in *Purg.*, xviii, 66 where Free Will is said to bring merit in proportion as it "garners or winnows out good and bad loves,"<sup>17</sup> the figure is evidently one of separating the chaff from the good grain.

H. D. AUSTIN

*University of Southern California*

14. E.g., by Torraca.

15. The reference to the pigs of the Antonian monks, four verses later, confirms and heightens this flavor of nastiness.

16. Cf. *Conv.*, iv, vii, 4, where *mondare* is used of *weeding* a wheatfield.

17. Vs. 65 f.: "... secondo/che buoni e rei amori accoglie e viglia"—really: "welcomes and winnows. . . ."

## MATERIALS FOR A REAPPRAISAL OF SIXTEENTH-CENTURY FRENCH SOCIETY

---

THE SOCIETY of the sixteenth century has never had its proper evaluation at the hands of the literary historian. From the time of Malherbe to the present day there has prevailed the opinion that society in the proper sense of the word did not begin until the era of Mme de Rambouillet. Brunetière, for example, declared, "Il faut venir jusqu'aux premières années du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle pour voir naître l'influence des femmes et commencer l'histoire de la société polie."<sup>1</sup> And following this and similar statements, the manuals of French literature have made it the rule to exalt the social spirit of the seventeenth century while giving scant attention to the society of the Renaissance. Recently, however, enough new material has come to light to make possible a new synthesis of sixteenth century social studies.

The earliest study which affords material for a new approach to sixteenth century society is Edouard Frémy's *L'Académie des derniers Valois*, which appeared in 1887 (Paris, Leroux). Following this, in 1900, came Victor Du Bled's *La Société française du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle au XX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, Perrin), a work which insisted on the literary and social importance of the women of the Renaissance. In 1907 appeared Gustave Reynier's *Le Roman sentimental avant l'Astrée* (Paris, Colin), which did even more to undermine traditional concepts of sixteenth-century *politesse*. Since this study, research into all phases of sixteenth-century society has moved forward. There have been studies of individual social groups like those of Jean de Morel,<sup>2</sup> Mesdames des Roches,<sup>3</sup> La Reine Margot,<sup>4</sup> and numerous incidental treatments of *salons* and social gatherings in biographical and critical writings concerning the sixteenth-century poets.<sup>5</sup>

1. Ferdinand Brunetière, "L'Influence des femmes dans la littérature française," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1<sup>re</sup> novembre 1886, p. 208.

2. Samuel F. Will, "Camille de Morel, A Prodigy of the Renaissance," *PMLA*, LI (1936), 83-110.

3. George E. Diller *Les Dames des Roches*, Paris, Droz, 1936.

4. Simonne Ratel, "La Cour de la Reine Marguerite," *Revue du Seizième Siècle*, XII (1924), 1-20, 193-207; XIII (1925) 1-43.

5. See for example Pierre Champion, *Ronsard et Villeroy*, Paris, Champion, 1925; Theodosia Graur, *Amadis Jamyn*, Paris, Champion, 1929; Jacques Lavaud, *Un Poète de cour au temps des derniers Valois: Philippe Desportes*, Paris, Droz 1936.

From the perusal of these recent studies comes the inevitable conclusion that the social gatherings of the sixteenth century were much more polite, much more numerous, and much more widely distributed chronologically than had been supposed.

It had been M. Reynier's contention that the development of the social arts came between 1594 and 1600, for it seemed to him that the first lasting peace which the French had enjoyed for some time afforded an unusual opportunity for social gatherings. There are, however, objections to this theory. Subsequent investigation has shown that the period indicated was one of social decline rather than otherwise. The ladies whom Professor Reynier mentions as the heroines of the *salons*, Mme de Villeroy, Mme de Retz, and others, were indeed important in the history of the *salons*, but their importance began *ca.* 1570-1575. By 1594, many of the most sociable persons of the age were in their graves. Ronsard, the poet of the *salons*, died in 1585, Dorat in 1588, Baïf in 1589. Jean de Morel, whose door was never closed to poet or humanist, died in 1581, and the Dames des Roches, hostesses of the literary men of Poitiers, in 1587. Mme de Villeroy died in 1596, and though Mme de Retz and La Reine Margot carried on throughout the reign of Henry IV, there is no evidence that any new *salons* were created toward the end of the century. The supposition that society developed rapidly after 1594 overemphasizes the effect of the Civil Wars, and implies that the continual conflict was destructive of social gatherings. Yet the existence of *salons* during the Civil Wars is evidence to the contrary and there is even an occasional implication in sixteenth-century writings that the wars stimulated compensatory activity. Jacques Yver, in the setting of his tales (1572), gives as the purpose of the gatherings he will describe:

... de soulager par amicable fréquentation les ennuis reçus durant cette misérable guerre civile, et détrempier le sel amer qu'en pourroit apporter la souvenance.<sup>6</sup>

Unfortunately, the breadth and duration of social activity in the century is seldom seen in its entirety by the authors of studies of a single social group. Almost without exception the individual scholar has focused his attention on a particular place and time and has lost sight of surrounding territory. Thus the statement frequently recurs that the discovery of this or that social group has presented literary history a precious oasis in the midst of an otherwise arid desert. Of late, with studies continuing to appear, there has been less insistence on this

6. Jacques Yver, *Le Printemps d'Yver*, Paris, Société du Panthéon Littéraire, 1841, pp. 521-522.

point, but that it is still occasionally maintained is evidenced by this statement in Jacques Lavaud's recent biography of Desportes:

Nous allons pénétrer dans le plus illustre des salons littéraires de l'époque, celui dont sortit vraisemblablement, au siècle suivant, le salon de la marquise de Rambouillet, en un mot dans le salon de la maréchale de Retz.<sup>7</sup>

Obviously M. Lavaud no longer believes with Brunetière and others that *salons* and the good breeding essential to their existence did not exist in the sixteenth century, but he does appear to favor the idea that Mme de Rambouillet must have had a single model for her social gatherings, and he proposes Mme de Retz as her model. Still there is a faint echo of the idea that the literary *salon* as a social institution had its beginning at an ascertainable date, and the implication that there could be but a single sixteenth-century group capable of arousing the admiration of succeeding and supposedly more refined generations.

But the existence of *salons* and the now existing chronicles of their doings suggest that the society of the times was by no means composed of a series of unconnected oases. It is interesting to see that the same names recur as one studies successively the better known *salons* of the period. Estienne Pasquier and Scévole de Sainte-Marthe, for instance, were the guests of Jean de Morel, of the Dames des Roches, and of Mme de Retz. Ronsard and Dorat appear in every Parisian social group of the age. Desportes was in equal favor with Mme de Retz and Mme de Villeroy. Baïf, the sponsor of the short-lived academy of poetry and music, was present at all gatherings of poets or courtiers. And the many cross-references to persons and places, encountered in the writings of poets and scholars, indicate a society of some homogeneity.

In the *salons* of the day, one finds every sort of pastime that is to be found in the *salons* of the next century. Literary quarrels were feverishly discussed; every conceivable form of light verse was cultivated from epitaphs for horses and dogs to anagrams on the names of poets' patronesses. Platonistic and religious sentiments were mingled with others of a more profane nature. Every lady had her pseudonym as in later days. Mlle des Roches was Carite; Marguerite de France, Minerve; Mme de Villeroy, Callianthe; Mme de Retz, Pasithée or Dictynne. Others were called Statyre, Pistere, Scaride, Fysée, and Sigifile, and the precisosity of the poets in addressing them is marked indeed.

Many other *milieus* also display the social spirit, and many sources of information concerning society remain untapped. Gatherings of men

7. Jacques Lavaud, *Un Poète de cour au temps des derniers Valois: Philippe Desportes*, Paris, Droz, 1936, p. 72.



have nowhere been adequately treated, and yet in the writings of the period there are innumerable accounts of meetings, dinners, and even picnics. During the time of Francis I, Olivier de Magny wrote glowing accounts of the hospitality of Hugues Salel, a churchman of the court.<sup>8</sup> Later, Belleau similarly praises Christofle de Choiseul, Abbé de Muireaux, his host and patron for many years.<sup>9</sup> Mellin de Saint-Gelais was also host to the poets, and a repast he tendered them is described by the Latin poet Vulteius.<sup>10</sup> Pontus de Tyard, the admirer of Louise Labé and Mme de Retz, also entertained, and in his Château de Bissy he received a group including Maurice Scève, Guillaume des Autels, Etienne Tabourot, and Jacques Peletier.<sup>11</sup> Jean Dorat held open house and in one of his Latin poems describes his own home as a seat of the Muses.<sup>12</sup> Jean Brinon, a counselor at law, was also fond of company. His country estates at Villennes and Médan were favorite rendez-vous for Dorat and his pupils, Ronsard, Baïf, Belleau, and Utenhove.<sup>13</sup> Henri de Mesmes, another lawyer, was likewise a genial host. Dorat, Passerat, L'Hospital, and Sainte-Marthe in particular were his welcome guests.<sup>14</sup> And to these a dozen other meeting-places might be added. How different is the spectacle of the poets and friends going from banquet to *salon*, and thence to the court of the kings, from the picture usually painted of the century as a time during which the Civil Wars stifled all social intercourse.

The testimony of poets and scholars as to the charm of the social gatherings they frequented is manifest throughout their writings. Scévole de Sainte-Marthe says of the *salon* of Mesdames des Roches that no man went out of the company without being more polished than before.<sup>15</sup> Pasquier, whose letters are replete with allusions to his many and varied social engagements, describes a dinner at the home of Mme de Retz, and he opens his letter with these words:

Il n'est pas dit qu'il faille avoir tousjours l'esprit tendu sur les livres, ou sur les sacs: quant à moy je ménage ma vie tout autrement que plusieurs: mon estude ne

8. Olivier de Magny, *Les Amours*, éd. E. Courbet, Paris, Lemerre, 1878, pp. 24-25.

9. Alexandre Eckhardt, *Remy Belleau, sa vie, sa 'Bergerie'*, Budapest, Nemeth, 1917, pp. 15-16.

10. Louis Delaruelle, "Un Dîner littéraire chez Mellin de Saint-Gelais," *RHL*, IV (1897), 408-411.

11. Abel Jeandet, *Pontus de Tyard*, Paris, Aubry, 1860, p. 94.

12. Jean Dorat, *Poemata*, Paris, Linocer, 1586, I, 220.

13. Pierre de Nolhac, *Ronsard et l'humanisme*, Paris, Champion, 1921, pp. 16-19.

14. Henry de Mesmes, *Mémoires inédits*, éd. E. Frémy, Paris, Leroux, 1886, pp. 17-106. Also Scévole de Sainte-Marthe, *Eloges des hommes illustres*, mis en français par G. Colletet, Paris, 1644, p. 443.

15. Sainte-Marthe, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

m'est qu'un jeu. Pour le moins, le veux-je faire paroistre par cest eschantillon que je vous envoie.<sup>16</sup>

And he then proceeds to describe the joys of the evening's conversation. Béroalde de Verville, writing at least fourteen years before Mme de Rambouillet's *salon*, said:

Il n'y aura pas de plaisir si parfait que d'estre en bonne compagnie . . . où la modestie regne et les Dames aiment la vertu, avec lesquelles il y a plus de contentement qu'entre celles qui passent leurs temps aux plus mondaines vanités.<sup>17</sup>

Such statements clash with the conventional picture of the sixteenth-century man as a misanthropic, rugged individualist.

Finally, a precious testimony of social-mindedness is found in the writings of the *conteurs*. In each case the writer gives his *contes* a setting in which a number of interlocutors tell the stories. In the main this framework is borrowed from Boccaccio, Bandello, or the *Heptameron*, but in many cases it is possible to discern a genuine social gathering behind the conventionalized setting. Henri Clouzot, a student of Jacques Yver's *Printemps d'Yver*, conjectures plausibly that the scene of the tales is in reality the *salon* of Marie Yver, the sister of the author. Similarly, the *Contes d'Eutrapel* may reflect accurately the lawyer's clique frequented by the *conteur* Noël du Fail, and the *Matinées* and *Après-disnées* of Cholières may also have had their setting painted from life. Guillaume Bouchet, in his *Serées*, provides an elaborate social background and lends verisimilitude to a conjecture of reality behind his setting, for he says in his introduction:

De dire que j'ay redigé par escript en m'esbatant, seulement ce qui a esté dit par ceux qui ont assisté en nos assemblées, je ne veux user de telle vanité, mais dire franchement que j'ay travaillé à les recueillir autant qu'il m'a esté possible, n'ay peu faire mieux.<sup>18</sup>

Elsewhere Bouchet is even more specific in declaring his pleasure in banquets and parties. He says:

Entre plusieurs et honnestes passetemps, qu'on recherche pour l'allegement du corps et recreation de l'esprit, j'ay opinion que les banquets et convis non sumptueux, tiennent le premier lieu, principalement ceux qui se font entre familiers, voisins et amis, sans grand appareil.<sup>19</sup>

After Bouchet came Gabriel Chappuys, whose *Facétieuses Journées*, while not in the least in the *salon* tradition, are given a social group for

16. Estienne Pasquier, *Œuvres*, Amsterdam, 1723, II, 897.

17. Béroalde de Verville, *Le Cabinet de Minerve*, cited by Reynier, *op. cit.*, p. 171, n. 2.

18. *Les Serées*, éd. C. Roybet, Paris, Lemerre, 1873-1882, I, xxiv.

19. *Ibid.*, I, v.



a setting as are the other collections of tales written in this supposedly unsocial period.

Other scattered evidences of the social spirit and preoccupation with good breeding can be noticed in the wide interest in books which emphasized a courtly ideal. *Il Cortegiano* was translated into French in 1537, and *Amadis* in 1540, and their vogue continued throughout the second half of the century. In addition, there were circulated a number of etiquette books with such titles as *Le Manuel d'amour*, *Le Breviaire des amoureux*, but most of these belong to an age when society was declining. It was under the stimulus of the competition of a younger generation, soon to be headed by Mme de Rambouillet, that the older generation of the nineties became so self-conscious as to need advice in the matter of conduct. But before this symptom appeared the French people had participated in social movements which yield nothing in splendor to those of the following age.

And so with *salons*, *cénacles*, *préciosité*, an accepted mode of social intercourse, and a widely organized society whose members were provincial and Parisian, nobles and commoners, literary men and diletantes, the society of the sixteenth century appears to deserve reappraisal. As one follows the social movements of the age from the exuberance of Marguerite de Navarre's court in the full bloom of the Renaissance through the groups successively formed up to the time of Henry IV, one's impression, if it is not that of a coherent, orderly progress like that of the social movement accompanying the march of classicism in the next century, is at least that of a movement colorful, varied, and forever animated. The men and women of the period were not attempting to create an institution, and in their informality lies the charm of their gatherings and the reason perhaps for their neglect at the hands of the literary historian.

L. CLARK KEATING

University of Illinois

## RACINE'S *BÉRÉNICE*

PROFESSOR MICHAUT'S BOOK, *La Bérénice de Racine* (Paris, 1907), appends a strange corollary to the well-argued conclusions of its first half. That first half is the really valuable part of his volume; it reveals the unsubstantial basis of the legend that Henriette d'Angleterre suggested to Corneille and Racine that each should write a play on the story of Titus and Berenice, and offers an alternative explanation for the practically simultaneous appearance of Racine's tragedy and Corneille's dealing with the same subject.

It was at this time, according to M. Michaut, that the feud between the two poets was bitterest. Their relations had first become strained when Corneille declared, after reading *Alexandre*, that Racine's proper field was not drama. With the sensational success of *Andromaque* Corneille's partisans, jealous of his eclipse, were heard belittling the achievement of his young rival, who, they said, could write a pretty play about love but had not the virile power and broad historical grasp of their own idol; such criticism led Racine to choose a theme from Roman history, and involving political motives, for his next tragedy and thus to vie with Corneille in his own peculiar domain; and when this play, *Britannicus*, encountered a disappointing reception, he laid the blame upon Corneille himself. Then, while his real or fancied wrongs rankled sorest within him, he must have learned, in some way, that his foe was at work upon the drama *Tite et Bérénice*. Here, Racine felt, was a subject which he could treat more successfully than Corneille. He would write upon it, also; he would work with all possible speed and have his version of it completed as soon as the other one; produced at the same time, the two plays would decide by their respective fortunes who was the greatest tragic poet of France. Thus he would at once exalt himself and discomfit the man he hated. It is a matter of record that he did.

But M. Michaut does not stop with formulating this plausible hypothesis to account for the *Bérénice* of Racine. He maintains that if such a hypothesis be accepted, *Bérénice* becomes of capital importance among the works of its author. Its subject was taken by Racine because it was appropriate to his dramatic system; because better than any other it gave him a chance to exhibit the theory of that system and to apply it effectively. That he should be victorious in the contest which he had initiated was imperative; for a new defeat, after *Britannicus*, would

definitely relegate him to the second rank and confirm the supremacy of his rival; all his future as a dramatist and the future of his conception of drama were at stake. Therefore is it not clear, says M. Michaut, that he mustered all his powers and made every effort of which he was capable, and that thus *Bérénice* must be the most carefully wrought, the most perfect, the most Racinian of the plays of Racine?<sup>1</sup>

It is clear indeed that on this occasion Racine must have tried his hardest to surpass Corneille; but the rest of M. Michaut's deductions may well be disputed. To surpass Corneille: that was Racine's object, whether he initiated their contest himself or was forced into it by the Princess Henriette; and success, as M. Michaut rightly points out, was absolutely vital to him. Such being the case, he would surely use any methods that seemed most likely to accomplish his aim, even though they consorted ill with his literary ideals. In this play, above all others, he was attempting to win the plaudits of his immediate audience, not of posterity. It is, of all his plays, the one in which we should least expect to see him trying to exemplify his dramatic theory instead of trying solely to be popular; it is the one in which we should most expect him to compromise with current tastes and fashions, however little he relished them at heart. If, as M. Michaut thinks, he himself chose this subject for competition with Corneille,<sup>2</sup> he did so because he believed it one which he could handle in a way that would please the public better than Corneille could—and not because it was peculiarly suited to illustrate his conception of what a tragedy should be. A *pièce de combat* is not the place where one exhibits ideals and illustrates theories. The public to be courted is little concerned with such things.

It is not likely, then, that *Bérénice* should be the best embodiment of Racine's dramatic creed. As for M. Michaut's other contention, that it is the most perfect of his plays, this too is improbable, *a priori*, because of the haste of its composition and the objective it had. M. Michaut himself admits, a page or so earlier, that the subjects of pure passion, such as Racine found in his master Euripides, from which his rivalry with Corneille long diverted him, were better suited to his genius. But the merits of a drama should not be determined by *a priori* arguments of probability, but by an investigation of the drama itself.

1. *Op. cit.*, p. 137.

2. M. Léon Herrmann has argued (*Mercure de France*, CCIII, 313-337) for the directly contrary hypothesis: that it was Racine who independently began a drama about Titus and Berenice, and that it was Corneille who tried to outdo and humiliate his rival. Professor H. C. Lancaster demonstrates, however, in his monumental work, *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*, Part III (The Johns Hopkins Press, 1936), pp. 573-575, that the probabilities are wholly with Professor Michaut.

"Your true Racinian of the inner circle sets *Bérénice* above all other plays," observes the author of a popular biography of Racine in English (Mary Duclaux, *The Life of Racine*, p. 99). That alleged fact, even if it be a fact, is of no critical importance. People who do not stop at intelligent appreciation of a writer, but form a cult to bow down and worship him, may be expected to be blind to his characteristic defects and perhaps actually relish them, or else they would not make a fetish of him; in consequence they are likely to feel especial admiration for those of his works in which these defects are most prominent. Thus the typical Dante cultist considers the *Paradiso* his masterpiece; scarcely otherwise explainable is Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's amazing opinion that *The Tempest* is a more precious literary treasure than *Hamlet* or *Othello* or *King Lear* (or the *Odyssey* or the *Divine Comedy*); and a Wordsworthian shows marked partiality for such poems as "The Character of the Happy Warrior" and "She was a Phantom of Delight."

*Bérénice* enjoyed a notable success when first produced, and in modern times Jules Lemaître in France and G. Lytton Strachey in England have praised it highly. The economy of plot, whereby an entire drama has been made out of such meager material, and the easy, changing flow of its verse from colloquial simplicity to extreme poetic beauty are justly celebrated. On the other hand, neither the great Sainte-Beuve nor N.-M. Bernardin, of later critics one of the best grounded in the dramatic literature of the seventeenth century, rated it among Racine's masterpieces, or even among his plays of the second rank with *Bajazet* and *Mithridate*. From the time of its original performance to the present day, it has been thought by many to possess too slight a theme—to be, indeed, an elegy in dramatic form rather than a tragedy. Such a view may be justified; but *Bérénice* has faults which are far worse than that. These faults are obscured by its traditional fame as a classic; but a candid examination will discover that, however congenial to that immediate public to which it was addressed, the characters and codes of conduct to be found in it are such as must greatly lessen its permanent appeal and thereby the estimate of its worth.

The effectiveness of the play depends primarily on our admiration and sympathy for its three principal figures, Titus, Berenice, and Antiochus. The tone and treatment throughout make it impossible that we should find artistic satisfaction in contemplating the anguish of these characters with ironical cynicism, as we are meant to contemplate the writhings of the weak or base *dramatis personae* in some plays of the modern naturalistic school. Berenice herself shows in her words of

last farewell how the author intended us to regard the story which he put upon the stage.

*... servons tous trois d'exemple à l'univers  
De l'amour la plus tendre et la plus malheureuse  
Dont il puisse garder l'histoire douloureuse.*

(ll. 1502-1504)

The love of Titus and Berenice was, traditionally, one of the great loves of all time; as such it was known to Racine, and as such he made it the subject of his drama. Now a truly great love, a love which in its frustration fills us with the sense of human dignity and lofty pathos and piteous waste so that the tragic emotion is aroused, can proceed only from great souls—that is, from essentially noble souls.<sup>3</sup> There is material for very moving, powerful drama in the theme of two such lovers placed in circumstances which compel, on grounds of transcendent importance, their renunciation of each other. But the Titus and Berenice of Racine are emphatically not great and noble souls, and the moral issues which confront them are somewhat nebulous.

A man's choice between the claims of empire, to which his own worth and a nation's preference call him, and of a deeply beloved and deeply loving woman involves, in itself, no easy struggle. Many people today, if not in Racine's day, would sympathize with, and commend, a decision in favor of the latter alternative. But the dramatist throws added weight into that scale of the wavering balances. For five long years his Titus has assured Berenice that no considerations of State shall part them, and thus has encouraged her to let her love for him grow without restraint and without fear that his choice will one day be against her; only on his actual accession to the throne, with its sobering sense of responsibility, does his resolve weaken and change. We may well question whether Berenice is not correct in maintaining that a man who has so thoroughly committed himself has no right to draw back. Moreover, it may reasonably be argued that the obligation of Titus to employ his ability to serve the Roman commonwealth is vitiated or even quite canceled by the fact that he owes that ability entirely to Berenice; it was her love which inspired him to be no longer a profligate; the valor and benevolence of Titus are her creation, and *she* owes no debt to Rome, being a foreign queen—rather is Rome in *her* debt

3. Cf. Racine's own defence of *Bérénice* in his Preface to the play: "Ce n'est point une nécessité qu'il y ait du sang et des morts dans une tragédie: il suffit que l'action en soit grande, que les acteurs en soient héroïques, que les passions y soient excitées, et que tout s'y ressente de cette tristesse majestueuse qui fait tout le plaisir de la tragédie."

for the services which Titus has already rendered to his country.

It would have been easy for Racine to present more compelling grounds for the lovers' sacrifice. With scant departure from history he could, for example, have brought out the point that if Titus should renounce the imperial diadem it would fall to his brother Domitian, a monster like Nero, whose reign would cause untold suffering.<sup>4</sup> He has not chosen, however, to do anything of the sort. On the contrary, it would seem that he has deliberately made the case for Berenice as strong, and the case for Rome as weak, as possible in order that he might show that even thus the claims of empire are paramount.<sup>5</sup> His opinion may not be our own, but we can understand it—at least in some measure. It is a corollary of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings, which was then current. If a monarch rules by divine right, he is God's chosen one for the task of ruling, and to decline that task would be to flout God's will—would be, in Dante's phrase, to make the great refusal, an act at once cowardly and impious.<sup>6</sup> But the divine call to the throne does not seem to have been looked upon merely as imposing the practical obligation to govern a State; it was viewed as something like a challenge to a man's own self-respect. With kingship was imagined to come

4. In reality, Titus might have appointed some other heir, but the author could have assumed, as he does throughout *Britannicus* and as his audience would assume, that the succession was hereditary, just as it was in France. Yet even in that situation, so great a claim had Berenice upon her lover's loyalty that some of us would feel that the right thing for Titus to do was to put the question squarely before the Roman people whether they would accept him with Berenice or take another ruler, and if, in their prejudice against a queen and a foreigner, they chose the latter alternative, the consequences of their choice would justly be on their own heads. But a submission of the matter to the public would probably have resulted in a divided vote and the horrors of civil war.

5. Titus even puts to himself the question, implying a negative answer (ll. 1003-1004):

*Vois-je l'État penchant au bord du précipice?  
Ne le puis-je sauver que par ce sacrifice?*

6. Cf. the words of Titus himself (ll. 452-466):

*... si je penche enfin du côté de ma gloire,  
Crois qu'il m'en a coûté, pour vaincre tant d'amour,  
Des combats dont mon cœur saignera plus d'un jour.  
J'aimais, je soupirais dans une paix profonde  
Un autre était chargé de l'empire du monde;  
Maître de mon destin, libre dans mes soupirs,  
Je ne rendais qu'à moi compte de mes desirs.  
Mais à peine le ciel eut rappelé mon père,  
Dès que ma triste main eut fermé sa paupière,  
De mon aimable erreur je fus désabusé  
Je sentis le fardeau qui m'était imposé;  
Je connus que bientôt, loin d'être à ce que j'aime,  
Il fallait, cher Paulin, renoncer à moi-même;  
Et que le choix des Dieux, contraire à mes amours,  
Livrait à l'univers le reste de mes jours.*



a noble ambition to reign, which none but a dastard would disregard. Empire must be yielded only with life. Everything else must give way to it in importance.<sup>7</sup> Again and again Titus speaks of his *gloire*, which compels him to take the step he finally takes; *gloire* has indeed something of the sense of "duty" or "obligation," but not wholly nor alone that sense; it can better be rendered by "honor" or "glory" or "reputation"—often best by the old phrase "fair fame."

Now, if an author conforms to the moral concepts of his own age, he does reasonably well; but if he is true to moral concepts of permanent validity, he does still better—as he needs must do to achieve anything really great. If the moral concepts implicit in his work are not of permanent validity, his work is to that extent a thing of his own age, not of all time. There are, of course, different degrees of validity and of universality. The self-imposed task of Sophocles' *Antigone* does not seem to us a duty, but there is nothing evil in it—only nobility and love—and we can imaginatively conceive of her feelings about it and sympathize with them and with her. But the *gloire* of Racine's Titus makes him break his plighted word to a woman who loves him, and it is not so much duty to others as it is a pride which is dependent upon conformity to ideas now obsolete.

To make matters worse, the dramatist shows that Berenice herself cannot understand Titus's viewpoint.<sup>8</sup> She eventually appreciates some of the considerations by which he is constrained, but never his notion of *gloire*; it seems to be a concept which a sovereign fully grasps only after he is invested with sovereignty, and is hence a specimen not of universal morality but of that "private morality" which Lemaître condemns in the characters of Corneille in his decline and of all the other playwrights of the period except Racine.<sup>9</sup> That such is its nature is proved by the fact that Titus in his hour of deepest despair thinks of suicide as an honorable way out of his troubles. If his *gloire* were an intelligible duty towards his country to discharge the task of ruling it which has been committed to him, his suicide would be no less a flight from that duty than his abdication would be; it would have all the disadvantages of abdication and none of its advantages; it would make

7. Cf. in Rotrou's *Cosroës* the change in Mardesanes after he is made king.

8. Till she learns his decision from his own lips, she believes his *gloire* compels him to cleave to her. (N. B., I. 908: "Il ne me quitte point, il y va de sa gloire.") Afterwards she says (I. 1103), "Hé bien! régné, cruel; contentez votre gloire:" and goes on to speak of his broken oaths to her and of his "injustice." It is hard for her to realize that he loves her.

9. Jules Lemaître, *Jean Racine*, Paris, 1908, pp. 131-134. Cf. also the same writer's article on Pierre Corneille in L. Petit de Julleville's *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française*, Paris, 1897, IV, 295.

both Rome and Berenice lose him, instead of only one or the other of them. Plainly, then, either his *gloire* is an artificial "point of honor," according to which it would be disgraceful to live without the crown if one has the opportunity to live with it;<sup>10</sup> or else his impulse to kill himself is so pusillanimous and so silly that he appears abject instead of nobly sympathetic as his rôle requires him to be.

But indeed all three of the major characters in the play are anything but sympathetic—Titus and Berenice and Antiochus alike. When Titus resolves to break with Berenice, he shirks at first the final interview and leave-taking which common decency demands of him, and asks Antiochus instead to acquaint her with his decision. He is afraid, he says, that he will weaken if he sees her again; and the fact is that he has already shown himself too weak to make the necessary explanations to her when the right opportunity was offered him to do so. Then Antiochus in his turn comes presently to the conclusion that he is unwilling to be the bearer of such evil tidings to the woman whom he himself has in secret loved long and hopelessly. He reflects that it will cause him fresh pangs to behold, in her tears, the evidence of how much she loves an-

10. Cf. ll. 1399-1406, where Titus says to Berenice:

*Où, Madame; et je dois moins encore vous dire  
Que je suis prêt pour vous d'abandonner l'Empire,  
De vous suivre, et d'aller, trop content de mes fers,  
Soupirer avec vous au bout de l'univers.  
Vous-même rougiriez de ma lâche conduite:  
Vous verriez à regret marcher à votre suite  
Un indigne Empereur, sans empire, sans cour,  
Vil spectacle aux humains des faiblesses d'amour.*

He exhibits the same conception earlier (ll. 1024-1026) in his self-reproaches for his hesitancy:

*Ah! lâche, fais l'amour, et renonce à l'Empire:  
Au bout de l'univers va, cours te confiner,  
Et fais place à des cœurs plus dignes de régner.*

Titus, in fact, is sure that he cannot live long when separated from his beloved. He tells her (ll. 1122-1125):

*Je n'aurai pas, Madame, à compter tant de jours.  
J'espère que bientôt la triste renommée  
Vous fera confesser que vous étiez aimée.  
Vous verrez que Titus n'a pu sans expirer . . .*

In that case his sacrifice of himself and Berenice will be of no real benefit to Rome. She interrupts his words with the very sensible question: "Ah! Seigneur, s'il est vrai, pourquoi nous séparer?" Her logic is wasted, because it is not the good of his country which chiefly concerns Titus, but the figure he himself will cut. His *gloire* requires that, while life is his, he shall cling to the scepter which has been placed in his hand; how long he may do so, is as heaven shall dispose, but he can at least (ll. 1173-1174)

*. . . laisser un exemple à la postérité  
Qui sans de grands efforts ne puisse être imité.*



other; so he plans to slip away without discharging the task intrusted to him or informing Titus that he will not discharge it, for "plenty of other people will come to apprise her of her misfortune"! This dastardly flight is forestalled by the chance entrance of Berenice herself. When he sees her, he cannot refrain from saying that he knows she is disappointed in not encountering Titus instead of him; he hints that there are distressing things which he might tell her, but he will not tell them.

*D'autres, loin de se taire en ce même moment,  
Triompheraient peut-être, et, pleins de confiance,  
Céderaient avec joie à votre impatience.  
Mais moi, toujours tremblant, moi, vous le savez bien,  
A qui votre repos est plus cher que le mien,  
Pour ne le point troubler, j'aime mieux vous déplaire,  
Et crains votre douleur plus que votre colère.  
Avant la fin du jour vous me justifierez.  
Adieu, Madame.*

(ll. 862-870)

Berenice, already alarmed by the manner in which Titus has avoided her, now fears anything and everything. She protests that to leave her thus in terrified suspense is more cruel than the ghastliest revelation could be. (This fact should have been apparent to any one!) She implores Antiochus to speak out, and finally, with entire justice, threatens him with her eternal hatred if he will not. When, thus constrained, he breaks the sad news to her in as kindly a manner as possible, she refuses to believe him, declares it all an infamous falsehood intended to cause dissension between her and Titus, and bids him, *even if he has not lied to her*, never to come into her presence again. The more clearly the situation is comprehended, the worse her conduct at this moment is seen to be. She has always in long years of trial found Antiochus a man of stainless honor who has put self behind him in his unwavering devotion to her interests (for of course she knew nothing of his design to flee from the task of enlightening her, and Racine obviously did not mean this to be a baseness in him); she does not really believe the outrageous charges which she flings in his face, but only wants to believe them, as she admits to Phenice a moment later; she is going instantly to Titus, she says, and she might at least wait to learn the truth from his own lips before making those charges. But no: what she has heard stabs her to the heart; and in blind anger at her pain, and in blind craving to assuage it (even by self-deception, and by cruelty and injustice to

the mortal who has been most loyal to her) she strikes out at the un-offending messenger—"naturally," says Lemaître, and the tenderness with which other critics treat her indicates that they share his opinion. "Naturally," beyond doubt, if by "naturally" one means according to the nature of some kinds of people. But such an act is not natural to a character whom it is possible to admire or to sympathize with; for honorable men and women do not lose all sense of rectitude and fairness, no matter how dire the shock of anguish that assails them. Shakespeare's Hermione would not have behaved like Berenice, nor would Racine's own Monime.

The one time in the play at which Antiochus appears genuinely to advantage is when he announces that he is cured of his love by such treatment, but it soon becomes evident that he is not. For the rest, he vacillates throughout between hope and despair. Titus, also, frequently wavers more or less in his adherence to what he believes to be the only right course for him; and there is a good deal of conscious pose in the things he says and does. As for Berenice, though she has been told by Antiochus that Titus is compelled to renounce her because of the Roman prejudice against queens and that he is half mad with helpless love and sorrow, she instantly concludes that if he leaves her he cares nothing for her. In Act V she at first refuses to see him again; and though she denies that she wishes heaven to avenge her upon him, she says that his own conscience will do so, and she repeatedly charges him with cruelty, indifference, and bad faith. A really great love tends to feel grief rather than anger if it thinks itself abused. But it also has more confidence in the beloved one than Berenice exhibits in Titus; though utterly unprepared for his decision and quite unable to see the rightness of it or to follow his arguments justifying it, she ought to believe him at least sincere, however tragically mistaken he might be—if hers were the love which is natural to the higher type of man or woman. Even before she hears that she and Titus must part, she is prone to find petty, personal explanations for what she cannot understand in her lover's conduct. When she comes to him in the second act and he shows constraint and perturbation and finally rushes from the room with stammered words about Rome and the empire, she does not account for his strange behavior in the obvious way, though Phenice has warned her that hostile public sentiment remains to be reckoned with; she imagines instead that Titus has learned of Antiochus' love for her and that he is jealous—a conventional hypothesis which, as Voltaire pointed out, would be entertained by characters on the stage rather than

by people in real life—and comforts herself with the conventional idea that if Titus feels jealousy, he loves her.<sup>11</sup>

"Conventional"—that word explains a large share of the blemishes of *Bérénice*. Not only was the view held by Titus of what befits a monarch the one which other French tragedies of the period would lead us to expect him to hold, but those tragedies frequently represent lovers as acting in a manner which today would be thought despicable. In the eternal discussions of love and its manifestations with which the salons of the seventeenth century busied themselves, it would seem that any ignoble impulse which might assail human beings in the grip of that passion was accepted as natural and therefore as legitimate—almost, even, as necessarily present in any love which is sincere—and this point of view came by way of the pastoral and "heroic" romances into the stereotyped, artificial drama of that day, which we call pseudo-classical or "romanesque," and so dominated it that its heroes and heroines are often quite beyond the pale of more enlightened sympathies.

No other play of Racine's after *Andromaque* has so much of the flavor of romanesque tragedy as *Bérénice*. Its very subject is, in essence, the one most frequently met with in the dramas of the two Corneilles, Quinault, and their fellows: a conflict between the claims of love and honor, or of love and the State. Each of the principal characters has a confidant, just as each does in *Andromaque*; nowhere else in Racine is the pairing thus complete and stiffly conventional. Of the three confidants in *Bérénice*, only Paulinus has the slightest individuality; Phénice is stupid even beyond the wont of confidants when she cannot imagine the reason for Titus's flight from her mistress, though it was she herself who insisted that the laws and feelings of Rome remained a serious obstacle. And in no other play after *Andromaque* is the conventional love-language of gallantry so jarringly in evidence.<sup>12</sup>

There is perhaps a reason for all this, quite beyond the exigencies of a contest with Corneille. More familiar than any other author of his

11. To some of us, Berenice's rebuke of Antiochus for declaring his love to her may seem another exhibition of the unamiable side of her character. But even today, for a man to tell a married woman that he loves her is regarded as an act of very doubtful propriety, and Racine's contemporaries evidently felt much the same way in the case of a woman who was betrothed. By drawing this parallel we can better understand the feelings of both Antiochus and Berenice throughout the first act; and it will be apparent that the Queen's behavior then was dignified and kindly—indeed, quite fine. Nor need we be surprised that when afterwards, in Act III, Antiochus comes again into her presence, she asks him somewhat sharply if he has not yet departed. She at that time fancies that Titus has been offended by the knowledge of his secret passion and its indiscreet avowal.

12. There is actually more of such language in *Phèdre* than in *Bérénice*, but in *Phèdre* it is so used that somehow it is much less objectionable.

times with the great tragedies of ancient Greece, Racine appears to have been actuated, throughout his career as a dramatist, by two ambitions: to write plays as nearly like those of Sophocles and Euripides as would be possible in seventeenth-century France, and to write plays that would be universally admired. *La Thébàïde* contains few pseudo-classical elements. Save for Creon's love for Antigone, it is a straight-forward attempt to put the story of the children of Œdipus as told by Seneca and the Greeks into the form of a French tragedy; its faults are for the most part merely those of inexperience. It enjoyed a very creditable success for a maiden effort, but nothing like the success that Racine had hoped for. Very well, he must have said to himself, if people did not care for what *he* preferred, he would show that he could give them what *they* preferred; and he wrote the wholly romanesque *Alexandre*, which was extremely popular. He had now proved that he could win favor; perhaps he could win it also with something more nearly to his taste. In *Andromaque* he took a long stride towards naturalness and truth, and both city and Court hailed his daring experiment with the wildest delight. He then went still further in the same direction in *Britannicus*; but this tragedy, though it became after a few years one of the most highly esteemed of his works, was a failure when first presented, until it was saved by the praise which Louis XIV bestowed upon it. Always sensitive to adverse criticism, its author in his disappointment thought of giving up writing for the stage, and only the influence of Boileau withheld him from such a step. *Bérénice* was the next product of his pen; it is hence of peculiar interest, coming as it does at a crucial point in his life.

Two courses lay open to him. He could continue resolutely in the vein of *Britannicus*, hoping that he might at length please the public with that sort of play, whether by more fortunate selection of subject or by educating his audiences to a better appreciation of true dramatic values, but in any event persisting in his own search for those values; or he could revert to the manner of *Andromaque*, in which case he would be certain to acquire fresh laurels. He chose the latter alternative. *Bérénice* has little less of pseudo-classical convention than has *Andromaque*,<sup>13</sup> and it scored a triumph. Thereafter, Racine again made progress away from romanesque tragedy and towards a purer form of art, but this time slowly and cautiously, through *Bajazet* and *Mithridate* to an *Iphigénie*

13. This fact is remarked upon by Bernardin in his edition of *Bajazet*, p. 54, note 12: "... avec *Bérénice* et *Bajazet*, Racine rentrait complètement dans la tragédie romanesque, avec laquelle il avait semblé vouloir rompre dans *Britannicus*"; but no one, apparently, has hitherto pointed out the reason for it.

which in large part is of genuine classical inspiration, and thence, doubtless reassured by the applause that had greeted each step, to the transcendent achievement of *Phèdre*.

To interpret thus the sequence and the nature of the secular plays of this great dramatist, is to gain also a new light on what ensued. Racine's retirement after *Phèdre*, when he was only thirty-seven years old and in the fullness of his powers, is generally ascribed in part to his disgust at the tactics of his enemies, which caused the failure of the play, and in part to the Jansenist influences which had colored his upbringing and which now regained control over him and convinced him of the sinfulness of his life and work. There can of course be no doubt of the importance of both these factors in shaping his decision, and they were probably paramount. Yet it is reasonable to think that discouragement, too, influenced him—discouragement at his ill success here again, as in the case of *Britannicus*, when he had departed furthest from pseudo-classical conventions. We are told in the *Mémoires*<sup>14</sup> of his son, Louis Racine, that he now wanted to depart even further from those conventions;—that he planned to go back to the pattern of ancient classical tragedy and show that the love-element could be dispensed with in French drama as well as in Greek. He thought of attempting the subject of *Œdipus* and treating it in its essential simplicity as Sophocles had done, without introducing any factitious love-episode like Corneille before him and Voltaire after him.<sup>15</sup> He did begin a play on the story of *Alceste*, which contains only conjugal love; this he destroyed, unfinished. He may well have felt that the unfavorable reception of *Phèdre* was not to be wholly ascribed to malicious intrigue, and that, on the contrary, the initial failure common alike to it and to *Britannicus* and experienced by none of his other tragedies indicated clearly that his public would never accept such approximations to a true classicism as alone would satisfy his own taste. It is very possible that he did not care to write any more plays, if this were true.

Then, after twelve years, Madame de Maintenon asked him to compose some scenes on a religious subject for her school-girls at Saint-Cyr; *Esther* was the result, and was highly successful. He at once undertook a full-length drama along the same lines in *Athalie*. Freed alike from his scruples and from the conventions of the professional stage, he threw himself into his new work with enthusiasm. He achieved his erstwhile ambition—to transplant the Greek form of tragedy, devoid of any love-

14. *Œuvres de J. Racine*, éd. P. Mesnard, Paris, 1885, I, 268-269.

15. Fénelon, *Lettre à M. Dacier sur les occupations de l'Académie* (1774).

interest, to French soil. For the third time, now, in his career, he broke away from romanesque pseudo-classicism. And for the third time he failed! He had broken away from it most thoroughly in *Athalie*, and *Athalie* failed the worst of all! Inadequate presentation ruined the performance of his play, and it was coldly received when published. He never tried again.

LACY LOCKERT

*Nashville, Tennessee*



## NEW VOLTAIRE-GABRIEL CRAMER LETTERS

---

THE LETTERS of Voltaire here published for the first time raise the total of his correspondence with the Cramer family by more than one hundred items. They are a part of the material mentioned in 1914 by Caussy in his *Œuvres inédites de Voltaire* as forthcoming in a subsequent publication, which, however, has not appeared in the twenty-four year interval.<sup>1</sup>

Previous editors have already printed a considerable number of Voltaire letters to the Cramers. To the twenty in Moland—of which one is addressed to Mme Gabriel Cramer—Claude Marie added seventy-two in an article, "Voltaire, diplomatie et cuisine littéraire," in the *Nain Jaune* for 1863, and, in the same year, Eugène Piot published fourteen more in the *Cabinet de l'amateur*. The Cornuau *Catalogue d'autographes* for 1933 lists an additional (?) sixty "lettres ou billets," sold without record. We are now able nearly to double the number known.

The name Cramer appears for the first time in Voltaire in a letter to Formey of July 29, 1752, which expresses satisfaction at the eulogy rendered Gabriel Cramer "professeur de philosophie à Genève" who had died a short time before. This famous mathematician was a relative of the brothers of whom we treat here. Voltaire first became acquainted with them two years later.

The Cramer family was in the eighteenth century, as today, a distinguished one in the life of Geneva. The branch which concerns us more immediately had two members with whom Voltaire did business: Gabriel Cramer (1723-93) and Philibert Cramer (1727-79). These were the sons of Guillaume Philibert Cramer and of Jeanne Louise, daughter of Gabriel de Tournes and Marie de La Rive. Gabriel Cramer married in 1751 Claire Delon de LaSalle in Languedoc. They had one son, Jean François Louis Cramer, born in 1752. Philibert Cramer married a woman of Russian extraction, Catherine de Wesselow, in 1766 and by her had three children: Marianne, Louis Gabriel and Antoinette

1. These, with other papers, were saved from the St. Fargeau fire and are now at the Bibliothèque de la Ville de Paris. The other papers I am now preparing for publication. I take occasion here to express my thanks to the American Council of Learned Societies for enabling me to copy the letters, to Professor I. O. Wade for his helpful suggestions, and to the librarians of the Bibliothèque de la Ville de Paris for courteously giving me access to the material.



Cécile. A relative, Claude Philibert, was in the printing business at Geneva and the brothers, Gabriel and Philibert Cramer, associated themselves with him, as the title-page of the *Bibliothèque de Campagne* of 1749 shows. This Claude Philibert, whose existence is questioned by M. Charrot,<sup>2</sup> but accepted by Bengesco,<sup>3</sup> had had unsatisfactory dealings with Voltaire.<sup>4</sup> The two brothers rendered important civil services to their city state, as the following data will show. Philibert Cramer withdrew from the printing business in 1762 and went to Paris, where he profited a good deal by the superior urbanity of the French. He became successively a member of the Council of the Two Hundred in 1764, *conseiller d'Etat* in 1767, and finally *trésorier-général* of Geneva in 1769. He won the enmity of Necker, the regularly appointed representative of Geneva at Paris, by getting himself nominated as a special envoy to Louis' court during the civil strife in Geneva.<sup>5</sup> Gabriel, the older brother, seems to have had a much less brilliant record politically, perhaps because, as Voltaire warned when he heard that Gabriel was about to be elected "auditeur," there was no time for both printing and politics. He became a member of the Two Hundred in 1758, as his son was to do in 1782. Membership in the *Conseil des deux cents* and in the *Petit Conseil* was for life.

The Cramers were no ordinary printers. They were men of culture and taste. Voltaire came to know them rather intimately through long association with them, and calls them "uomini onesti e di garbo."<sup>6</sup> Because of their elegance in manners and dress and their social aspirations, Voltaire speaks mockingly of them as the prince and the marquis. The "prince de Cramer" seems to have been more of a dandy. Philibert Cramer, très beau garçon quoique un peu bossu . . . c'est un seigneur aussi paresseux qu'aimable . . . il a de l'esprit, du goût."<sup>7</sup> In a note to his *Guerre civile de Genève*, Voltaire said of him<sup>8</sup> that he had acquired in his trips to Paris "toutes les grâces plaisantes et l'élégance des Français de meilleur ton." It was no doubt to save himself embarrassment under the name Cramer that when he went to Versailles later as Envoy extraordinary of the republic of Geneva he

2. "Quelques notes sur la 'Correspondance' de Voltaire," in *RHL*, xx, 174.

3. *Bibliographie*, I, 330 and IV, 55. See also Moland, xxxviii, 195.

4. *Œuvres complètes de Voltaire*, ed. Moland, Paris, Garnier, 1877-85, xxxviii, 195. Hereafter referred to as Moland.

5. Desnoiresterres, *Voltaire et la société au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, VII, 360.

6. Moland, XL, 20.

7. Moland, XLII, 316.

8. Moland, IX, 549 n.

had himself called "M. Philibert."<sup>9</sup> His intimate relationship with Voltaire was limited to the period between their first meeting at Colmar in 1754 when he urged the poet to establish himself at Geneva and his retirement from the printing business in the early sixties.<sup>10</sup> Though he thereafter at Paris busied himself with obtaining subscriptions to the work on Corneille whenever his pleasures did not interfere, this was not done to Voltaire's complete satisfaction.<sup>11</sup>

Gabriel Cramer, however, is the one who most concerns us here, as it is to him that the letters here published for the first time are written. The "marquis" is spoken of now as "ce gros joufflu," now "cher caro," now "caro Gabriele" and again as "M. Gabriel." That he had literary pretensions is evident from one of these letters, which says "Vous êtes un peu cygne" and from a statement, made by Gaullieur in his *Etudes sur l'histoire littéraire de la Suisse française*,<sup>12</sup> that he was the author of a comedy in prose called "l'Heureux Retour" which was played at Geneva. His ability as an actor both in *Mahomet* and in *Olympie* called forth Voltaire's praise:

Mais ce qui m'a le plus surpris, c'est notre ami, Gabriel Cramer. Je n'exagère point; je n'ai jamais vu d'acteur, à commencer par Baron qui eût pu jouer Cassandre comme lui; il a attendu et effrayé pendant toute la pièce. Je ne lui connaissais pas ce talent supérieur.<sup>13</sup>

The "gros Suisse" sometimes irked Voltaire by his negligence, as appears in the following:

Frère Cramer, afin que vous le sachiez, est très actif pour son plaisir et très paresseux pour son métier. Tel était Philibert Cramer, son frère, qui a renoncé à la typographie. Gabriel et Philibert peuvent mettre au rang de leurs négligences de n'avoir pas fait présenter à l'Académie un exemplaire de mes fatras sur les fatras de Pierre Corneille.<sup>14</sup>

On occasion he felt free to indulge his penchant for sociability by entertaining at the château at Tournay, which he borrowed from the poet in 1767.<sup>15</sup>

His association with Voltaire was a most profitable one and brought him some four hundred thousand francs profit in twenty years<sup>16</sup> since

9. Moland, XLVII, 16.

10. Moland, XLII, 316.

11. Moland, XLII, 374, 393.

12. P. 243 n.

13. Moland, XLII, 74; I, 345, 405; and Perey and Maugras, *La Vie intime de Voltaire*, Paris, 1892, p. 278.

14. Moland, XLVIII, 437.

15. Moland, XLV, 364, 389.

16. Moland, XLIX, 539, 545.

Voltaire generally made him a gift of his works,<sup>17</sup> for the market in the French provinces and abroad. Ordinarily Lambert, Panckoucke or someone else associated himself with the Genevan printers for the Paris market. The patriarch of Ferney speaks of Gabriel as having retired from printing before March 1776 and says that he is living in style in the country at the age of fifty-three.<sup>18</sup> He had traveled a good deal. In October 1756 he went to Paris to make a visit to Malesherbes, to whom he had a fine letter of introduction from Tronchin.<sup>19</sup> Later, in 1757, he went to Holland,<sup>20</sup> and in November of the same year we find him in Portugal.<sup>21</sup> His linguistic knowledge is evident in Voltaire's use of Spanish, Italian and Latin phrases in the correspondence. There is no love without its quarrels, and thus there had been gossip at various times of strife between the brothers and Voltaire which the latter denied in a letter of May 27, 1756:

Je ne sais pas ce qu'on veut dire par les prétendues dissensions des Cramer; il n'y en a jamais eu l'ombre. Ce sont des gens d'une très bonne famille de Genève, qui ont de l'éducation et beaucoup d'esprit; ils sont pénétrés des mes bienfaits, tout minces qu'ils sont.<sup>22</sup>

Later, in 1764 he indicates that efforts were being made to cause trouble between himself and Gabriel:

J'ai toujours sur le cœur la tracasserie qu'on m'a voulu faire avec Cramer. N'est-il pas bien singulier qu'un homme s'avise d'écrire de Paris à Genève que je jette feu et flamme contre les Cramer, que je parle d'eux dans toutes mes lettres avec dureté et mépris, que je veux faire saisir leur livre, etc. etc.

Vous me feriez grand plaisir d'écrire à Gabriel qu'on l'a mal informé . . . et je crois avoir fait assez de bien aux Cramer pour être en droit de compter sur leur reconnaissance. . . . Les Cramer sont mes frères; ils sont philosophes, et les philosophes doivent être reconnaissants; je leur ai fait présent de tous mes ouvrages et je ne m'en repens point.<sup>23</sup>

Despite the poet's efforts, Gabriel showed some pique and wrote him a caustic letter which Voltaire sent to Paris to D'Argental:

Je ne crois pas qu'après la belle lettre de Gabriel Cramer que je vous ai envoyée, il s'empresse beaucoup de me servir.<sup>24</sup>

However, matters were patched up and the two became friends again.

17. Moland, XL, 428 and XLIII, 211.

18. Moland, XLIX, 545.

19. Nouvelles acquisitions, 3346, p. 212.

20. Moland, XXXIX, 180.

21. Moland, XXXIX, 307.

22. Moland, XXXIX, 48.

23. Moland, XLIII, 211.

24. Moland, XLIII, 212.

The following passage from the *Guerre civile de Genève* (1768)<sup>25</sup> may serve to render the person more real:

*Cramer un jour, ce Cramer dont la presse  
A tant gémi sous ma prose et mes vers,  
Au magasin déjà rongés des vers  
Le beau Cramer, qui jamais ne s'empresse  
Que de chercher la joie et les festins,  
Dont le front chauve est encor cher aux belles,  
Acteur brillant dans nos pièces nouvelles;  
Cramer, vous dis-je, aimé des citadins,  
Se promenait dans la ville affligée,  
Vide d'argent et d'ennuis surchargée.  
Dans sa cervelle il cherchait un moyen  
De la sauver, et n'imaginait rien.  
A sa fenêtre il voit Madame Oudrille,  
Et son époux, et son frère, et sa fille,  
Qui chantaient tous des chansons en refrain  
Près d'un buffet garni de chambertin.  
Mon cher Cramer est homme qui se pique  
De se connaître en vin plus qu'en musique.  
Il entre, il boit; il demeure surpris, . . .*

The letters and chits published hereinafter are written, for the most part in Voltaire's own hand, to his publisher, Gabriel Cramer. I have striven to date them on the basis of the material they treat, while fully cognizant of the probability of error involved. They range from 1755 to 1776. We see the poet on the most intimate of terms with his printer. Jokingly he says "nous sommes mariés ensemble" till death do us part and so "point d'infidélités dans nos amours." That Gabriel only too well deserved the appellation "le négligent frère Gabriel" is evident from the correspondence.<sup>26</sup> On occasion he is the only one on whom Voltaire can depend<sup>27</sup> and indispensable for procuring him the books he needs—now from the Bibliothèque de Genève, now from friends and now by purchase. He coaxes and cajoles him in the statements—"Vous m'abandonnez cruellement" or "Vous étiez né pour être un brave citoyen, un homme très aimable mais point du tout pour être libraire." Again the gentle reproach turns to saucy criticism as in: "Il est important qu'on ait une conversation avec M. Cramer et on ne peut lui parler tant qu'il est à cheval dans les rues." Voltaire sends greetings to his son, Jean Louis, and to his French wife, whom he admires as a "femme de beaucoup d'esprit" and a person "honnête et savante et profonde"

25. Moland, IX, 549.

26. Moland, XLIII, 455; XLV, 364; XLII, 450.

27. "Gabriel Cramer, le seul à qui je puisse me fier," Moland, XLV, 284.

who could make irreverent remarks à la Voltaire.<sup>28</sup> She, in turn, in neighborly fashion, sends him a bowl of plums for his dessert. The patriarch expresses tender concern for his "caro," who is suffering from the gout and offers New Year's greetings in a humorous vein—

Votre premier garçon vous souhaite la bonne année après 18 ans d'un travail journalier.

Gabriel's anxiety to print every work that Voltaire ever wrote and some that he did not is reproved gently at times and at others more strongly, apparently to little avail:

Je suis très affligé mais je vous embrasse de tout mon cœur . . .

Je vous gronde comme éditeur mais je vous en demande pardon comme à mon ami. Vous imprimez tout ce qu'on ramasse et qu'on m'impute. Je ne reconnais là ni votre goût ni votre amitié.

Then too, we see Voltaire *chez lui*—now planting while the world is at war, now expressing disgust with his Cornelian labors, now inviting Cramer to drink a toast with him or to come to dine another day because of some difficulty which has arisen at Ferney. Again we see him suffering from an attack of sciatica or taking the blame for having provoked his monkey, Luc, to bite him. All in all, the correspondence furnishes a genial picture of the close cooperation and the intimate friendship which existed between author and printer.

## I

[1755?]

vraiment voicy une bonne sottise de ma facon dont je viens de m'apercevoir  
*ripaille je te vois!*<sup>29</sup> o bizarre amedee

*de quelle maudite erreur  
ton ame fut possedee!*

il n'y a point de Rine [*sic*] a erreur.

cest un oubli dont personne ne s'etait apercu  
il faut mettre

*de quel caprice ambitieux  
ton ame fut possedee*

mais est-il encore temps?

*a Monsieur  
Monsieur Crammer  
presto presto*

28. Moland, VIII, 530; XXXIX, 397, XLI, 257; XLIII, 459.

29. A variant for Epitre LXXXV, dated March, 1755. Cf. Moland, x, 363-364 and xxxviii, 376. A letter quoted in Formey's *Souvenirs*, Berlin, 1789, II, 71 says this poem offended the court of Savoy.

## II

[May, 1755?]

la grande affaire pour la revision des feuilles est la punctuation [sic] qui est tres fautive danc l'edition d'Allemagne.<sup>30</sup> le sens fini ou interrompu, doit guider le correcteur qui seul aura soin de l'edition pendt [sic] mon absense<sup>31</sup> [sic] je netais venu icy<sup>32</sup> que pour conduire cette edition,<sup>33</sup> mais je ne pourai la suivre etant a lausanne et a berne. j'enverrai dans quelque temps le reste de l'hist gen [sic].<sup>34</sup> lorsque je seray tranquile, et en etat de reprendre des travaux abandonnez [sic] il me manque du 1er tome depuis P jusqu'a V— et depuis X jusqu'a la fin. du troisieme tome il me manque de P jusqu'a V, et depuis Z jusqu'a la fin. M. Crammer est prie de m'envoyer ces feuilles parce que je fais mes paquets. je m'amuserai a faire un errata. il doit avoir les manuscrits [sic] qui doivent servir aux cartons. il me manque aussi depuis y dans le volume des melanges.<sup>35</sup>

## III

[1755?]

le lausanois<sup>36</sup> dit que le grassouillet<sup>37</sup> ne craint rien qu'il enverra aux magistrats de geneve la lettre fulminate que M. C.<sup>38</sup> luy a ecritte. le lausanois ajoute que la seule moderation peut operer sur le bon cœur de friponau grassouillet. le lausanois dit encor qu'on a offert a friponau des manuscrits [sic] du temps de charles 7.<sup>39</sup> le lausanois dit que luy meme pourrait deterrer ces manuscrits sil n'etait pas un homme tres relligieux [sic] et moy je dis que je vous aime de tout mon cœur. faites comme il vous plaira pr [sic] les epitres je suis bien embarasse d'ailleurs mille respects a Me C.<sup>40</sup>

30. The Dresden edition of 1752? Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, IV, 46.

31. This trip may be that mentioned in a letter of May 15, 1755. Cf. Moland, XXXVIII, 375.

32. To les Délices?

33. This refers to the *Collection complète des œuvres de Voltaire. Première édition*, 1756. Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, IV, 50.

34. *Essai sur l'histoire générale*, which later became *Essai sur les mœurs*, 1756. Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, I, 327.

35. Moland, XXXVIII, 522.

36. A. N. Polier de Bottens (1713-?), minister at Lausanne? Cf. Moland, XXXVIII, 386 and 431.

37. François Grasset, a bookseller of Lausanne, who had been dismissed by the Cramers and who attempted to sell a pirated manuscript of *La Pucelle* to Voltaire, who had him arrested. Cf. Moland, XXXVIII, 268, 381 ff. and Bengesco, *op. cit.*, III, 301, and IV, 86. See Mahrenholtz, "Voltaire und Grasset" in the *ZFSL*, VIII, 36 and Perey and Maugras, *La Vie intime de Voltaire*, pp. 98-112, 226, 230.

38. Monsieur Cramer?

39. *La Pucelle*.

40. Madame Cramer.

## IV

[1756?]

des que le fidele vaniere<sup>41</sup> [sic] sera revenu, nous mettrons en ordre la preface et le 1er volume des pieces de theatre<sup>42</sup> si vous pouvez mon cher caro me deterrer chez bardin<sup>43</sup> ou ailleurs un Daubigne<sup>44</sup> j en meublerais ma bibliotheque mais vous netes point bouquiniste je crois que la demarche aupres des mediateurs est une haute impertinence, a moins que la declaration ne soit concue dans les termes les plus respectueux et menages avec un art dont certaines gens sont peu capables.

Monsieur Crammer

## V

[1756?]

javais mande a l'imprimerie qu'on m'envoias [sic] la seconde epreuve. point de nouvelles pour n'avoir pas revu assez d'epreuves il se trouve quil [sic] y a 104 fautes au tome 4eme de l'histoire.<sup>45</sup> Si mr. crammer pouvait me faire acheter le xameron [sic] rustiq: [sic]<sup>46</sup> je luy serais bien oblige. j espere que j aurai le warburton<sup>47</sup> torsi<sup>48</sup> et maintenant<sup>49</sup> j attendais une feuille nouvelle il faudrait se presser un peu car j iray bientot a monrion<sup>50</sup> mille compliments a toute la famille.

Monsieur Crammer

## VI

[1756?]

je me flatte que Mr crammer [sic] voudra bien accepter un lit a monrion dans son voyage aux bains. j'attends les lettres de M. le comte d'avaud<sup>51</sup> et les autres livres promis.

41. Wagnière, secretary to Voltaire from 1754 until 1778.

42. Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, I, 88 (#308).

43. Bardin was a book dealer at Geneva. Cf. Moland, XLIX, 500, 536, 544, LI, 84.

44. Probably *Les Aventures du baron de Foeneste* by Théodore Agrippa d'Aubigné. Cf. Moland, XVIII, 185, 189.

45. *Essai sur l'histoire générale* (1756).

46. *L'Hexaméron rustique* by La Mothe le Vayer. The copy in Voltaire's library was dated Amsterdam, 1608. Cf. Havens and Torrey, "Voltaire's Books," *MP*, XXVII, 12.

47. Was this the *Divine Legation of Moses* by William Warburton? Cf. Havens and Torrey, *loc. cit.*, p. 20. See *Lettres et billets de Voltaire*, ed. by Bengesco, p. 9, 16.

48. J. B. Colbert, marquis de Torcy, whose *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des négociations* appeared in 3 volumes in 1756.

49. This may refer to La Beaumelle's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Mme de Maintenon* (1755-1756) or to his *Lettres de Madame de Maintenon* (1756). Cf. Moland, XIV, 100, and XXXIX, 52 ff.

50. A property between Lausanne and Ouchy acquired as a winter residence in 1755. Cf. Perey and Maugras, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

51. Claude de Mesmes, comte d'Avaux, *surintendant des finances*, died in 1650 at the age of 55 years. In 1650 the *Lettres de d'Avaux et de Servien* were published. Voltaire refers to the letters of d'Avaux in his *Siècle de Louis XIV*. Cf. Moland, XIV, 297 and XV, 29.



Mr.d argental est bien etonne de n'avoir point recu son exemplaire. il serait tres necessaire qu'un des deux freres<sup>52</sup> eut la bonte de passer aux delices.<sup>53</sup>

*Monsieur Crammer*

## VII

[1756?]

Monsieur caro voudra bien se souvenir que je lui ai donne ce meme tome dix quil demande il y a peu de corrections et les occupations presentes ne me laissent pas une minute pour en faire de nouvelles. mille tendres compliments.

*Monsieur Gabriel Crammer*

## VIII

[1756?]

je vous supplie de m'envoyer un lisbonne cretien<sup>54</sup> au nom de notre repos ne permettez pas qu'on vende chez vos habitants de la bourgogne transjurane<sup>55</sup> aucun volume separe.<sup>56</sup>

*Mrs. Crammer*

## IX

[1756?]

page 333 du tome 8  
mettez partout jaurigni a la place de Salieda<sup>57</sup>

## X

[1756?]

Mon cher gabriel s'il arrive que vous fassiez un jour une nouvelle edition de mon fatras<sup>58</sup> histori: nous y ferons quelques additions assez curieuses. nous voila a present chez une nation qui nous presente de grands contrastes. il y a des peuples bien differents dans paris. aprofondissez l'histoire de la lettre et de la petite [?] poudre je vous en prie. ne negligez rien pour instruire l'historien.

recomandez moy a briasson<sup>59</sup> pour un envoy de livres que je luy demande par la route de lyon a l'adresse de tronchin<sup>60</sup> le banquier qui payera comptant je vous embrasse bien tendrement.

V.

*Mr. gabriel crammer*

52. The Cramer brothers.

53. The name of the residence near Geneva which Voltaire acquired in February, 1755.

Cf. Moland, XXXVIII, 340.

54. One of the many versions of the *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne*, composed in November or December, 1755, and later altered.

55. Switzerland.

56. Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, I, 170 (619 and 620).

57. Moland, XII, 471-472 (*Essai sur les mœurs*).

58. Possibly the *Essai sur l'histoire générale*?

59. Briasson, a bookseller of Paris, who had charge of the *Encyclopédie*.

60. This man, a brother of the famous doctor and of the Councillor, was Voltaire's banker. Cf. H. Tronchin, *Le Conseiller François Tronchin et ses amis*, Paris, 1895, *passim*.

## XI

[1756?]

vous etes un vrai caro vous relisez. que de fautes!  
grand dieu! venez vous ce soir a henri 4?<sup>61</sup>

## XII

[1756?]

N B pour l'editeur  
on a eu soin de placer les variantes recueillies par M labbe Langlet<sup>62</sup> a la fin  
des pages.  
ainsi il faut les retrancher a la suite [sic] du poeme<sup>63</sup> et conserver seulement  
ses notes.

## XIII

[August 1756?]

pourquoi tuer ce singe?<sup>64</sup> cest moy qui ai tort. mes deux jambes sont bien  
obligees. la mordue fait bien moins de mal encor que l'autre affligee de siatique  
[sic]<sup>65</sup> je renvoye E, je tremble que vous n'ayez pas de quoy faire 300 pages.

## XIV

[1757?]

je vous demande en grace avant de partir mon cher editeur de vouloir bien  
faire tenir un exemplaire de votre seconde edition<sup>66</sup> a Mr darget<sup>67</sup> directeur  
de l'ecole militaire a l'ecole militaire a Paris. Je vous aurai une tres sensible  
obligation.

## V.

M. Crammer l'aine.

## XV

[1758-9?]

il me vient un scrupule monsieur mon editeur. le voicy. je dis qu'il vaut autant  
faire descendre les renes lappones des cerfs de finlande que les lappons de  
[sic] finlandois. mais il y a des gens qui me soutiendront que la chose est  
vraisemblable, et que les renes sont des cerfs degenez. buffon<sup>68</sup> pretend bien  
que les chiens de berger sont les peres des levrettes tranchons toute dispute et  
mettons:

61. The 1756 edition? Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, I, 108-109.

62. The abbé Lenglet-Dufresnoy was supposed to have been responsible for gathering the variants to the *Henriade*. Cf. Moland, XII, 6.

63. *La Henriade*, s.l. [Geneva], 1756. Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, I, 108-109.

64. Voltaire had been bitten in the leg by his monkey, Luc. Cf. Moland, XXIX, 101, and Desnoiresterres, *op. cit.*, v, 149.

65. Cf. Perey and Maugras, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

66. The 1757 edition. Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, IV, 63.

67. Darget (?-1778), ex-secretary to Frederick II. He left Berlin in March, 1752.

68. Cf. *Œuvres complètes de Buffon*, Paris, 1825, XII, 300-329, and Moland, XXXIX, 476.

il serait aussi convenable de dire que lherbe qui croit en laponie vient de lherbe du dannemarc ou de la suedé.<sup>69</sup>

vous n'avez pas encor commence a tirer. c'est pour demain. je vous prie instamment de faire cette petite reforme. voicy une petite carte pour le socinien Abausit.<sup>70</sup> reponse sil vous plait.

Monsieur Gabriel Crammer

## XVI

[1759?]

j'envoye a mon cher gabriel mon beau et honnete certificat.<sup>71</sup> avez vous quelques nouvelles<sup>72</sup> y a-t-il quelque Roy [sic] en prison a-t-on donne quelque bataille? j'attends des feuilles historiques poetiques critiques<sup>73</sup>

## XVII

eh bien ce manuscrit de ce memoire<sup>74</sup> si interessant—que vous m'avez promis,—que je devois avoir a huit heures du matin, a midy, a une heure, a deux heures? si vous m'avez donne de fausses esperances je ne vous le pardonnerai jamais.

## XVIII

[August 1759?]

pour me consoler de la bataille<sup>75</sup> perdue imprimons vite la victoire de Pultava.<sup>76</sup> mon cher editeur russe ne perdons pas un moment. ecrivez a paris pour la carte de russie, que bremon<sup>77</sup> depeche le pruth<sup>78</sup> il faudrait que tout fut fait dans quinze jours. apres quoi nous ferons autre chose si vous avez des nouvelles faites nous en part.

Monsieur G. Crammer

## XIX

[1759?]

Mon impatience se recommande a l'indifference de mon cher gabriele je l'embrasse avec esperance, et patience

69. This reading was for *Pierre le grand*, no doubt, yet it does not appear exactly as above either in the edition of 1759 or 1761. Cf. Moland, xvi, 400.

70. Firmin Abauzit (1679-1767) was a French Protestant who was reared at Geneva. He became a latitudinarian divine and librarian of that city. Cf. *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, Part v, letter 1.

71. The *Avis important sur l'Histoire de Charles XII*, which appeared first in 1759 in the first volume of the *Histoire de l'empire de Russie*. Cf. Moland, xvi, 142-143.

72. Of the Seven Years' War.

73. Possibly one of the *Mélanges*? Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, iv, 227.

74. This may be the *Mémoire sur le libelle clandestinement imprimé a Lausanne*, dated "12 février 1759," having to do with the piracy of Grasset. Cf. Moland, xxxiv, 85 ff.

75. Possibly the defeat at Minden, August 1, 1759. Cf. Moland, xl, 153.

76. I.e. Chapter xviii of the first part of the *Histoire de l'empire de Russie*. Cf. Moland, xl, 138 and 153, and Bengesco, *op. cit.*, i, 400.

77. Was Bremon an assistant to Cramer?

78. Chapter I of the second part of *Pierre* is entitled *Campagne du Pruth*.

## XX

[1759?]

plus d'impatience ny de patience; mais reconnaissance et de votre part point d'indifference mais envoyez vite a mon trou et aux erudits ma reponse est [sic] pour moy chose d'importance. venez demain habeo aliquid ad tibi dicendum de russia.<sup>79</sup>

## XXI

[March 1760?]

la lettre<sup>80</sup> civile et honnete est en bien gros caracteres  
mais la chose est faitte je vous aurai beaucoup d'obligation mon cher gabriel  
si vous voulez bien presser l'impression de ce rogaton cela na quun temps.  
cest un ephemere fait pour naître et mourir en un jour

## XXII

a tourney 22 [March 1760?]

j'attends que mon cher gabriel m'envoie la preface,<sup>81</sup> je suppose qu'il a eu la bonte de faire mettre la petite addition necessaire a la fin de la piece.  
il faut qu'il ait le diable au corps pour avoir tire 1000 [?] exemplaires de la coyonerie mahometane<sup>82</sup> il n y a pas trente cuistres qui s'interessent a cela  
c'est Rafet<sup>83</sup> a Toulouse qui imprime la feuille litteraire<sup>84</sup> que je crois de lombard<sup>85</sup> jesuite. tachons d'en connaitre l'auteur. nous guerroierons, je suis comme luc<sup>86</sup> j aime a guerroier le jesuite Saci<sup>87</sup> en appelle au parlemnt pr la lettre de change de 30000

## XXIII

[1760?]

pardon caro gabriele d'avoir dit qui je n'avais pas le 1er tome du manicheisme<sup>88</sup> que j'avais mais certainement je nay point la preface de l'ecossaise<sup>89</sup>  
quid novi?

Monsieur Gabriel Crammer

79. *Histoire de l'empire de Russie* (1759-1763).

80. *Lettre civile et honnête à l'auteur malhonnête de la critique de l'Histoire universelle de M. de V—, qui n'a jamais fait d'histoire universelle. Le Tout au sujet de Mahomet.* Geneve, 1760. Cf. Moland, xl, 330; xxiv, 109, 141, and Bengesco, *op. cit.*, II, 88.

81. Probably to *Le Caffé ou l'Ecoissaise*, 1760. Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, I, 55.

82. This would appear to be the *Lettre civile et honnête* (Cf. Moland xxiv, 141) mentioned in letter to D'Argental dated March 17, [1760].

83. Hatin offers no help.

84. We have been unable to determine the name. Not in Hatin.

85. Abbé Théodore Lombard, professor of rhetoric at the *Collège des Jésuites*, at Toulouse (1690-?) author of *Réflexions sur l'impiété prise du côté littéraire*. Cf. Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire* (éd. Tournoux) I, 322-323.

86. Frederick II.

87. In a letter of March 17, [1760], Voltaire refers to the Sacy affair. Cf. Moland, xl, 330.

88. This seems to be "l'excellente *Histoire du Manichéisme*" in 2 vols. by Isaac de Beausobre, who figures in the illustrious writers of the *Siècle de Louis XIV*. Cf. Moland, xiv, 39, xxvii, 354. See Chr. Bartholmess, *Histoire philosophique de l'Académie de Prusse*, Paris, 1851, I, 33 ff and II, 127 ff.

89. The comedy, *L'Ecoissaise*, was first printed in May 1760. Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, I, 55.

## XXIV

[April 1760?]

lecluse<sup>90</sup> est arrive; il est fort drole. il nya qu'une faute au *quand*<sup>91</sup> il faut punir les insolents: mortdieu jeanne<sup>92</sup> est prete il y a seulement trois ou quatre pompons qui manquent pierre<sup>93</sup> attendra tant mieux

## XXV

bravo, bravo, je vous remercie de tout mon cœur, caro gabriele, continuez toujours le 7<sup>me</sup> et avant quil soit huit jours jarrangerai tout pour finir. javais fort a cœur de ne point mourir avant d achever cette avanture.

V.

## XXVI

[1760?]

avez vous des *que*?<sup>95</sup>

pouriez vous caro gabriele men envoyer demi douzaine  
quid novi?

Monsieur Gabriel Crammer

## XXVII

[1760?]

je ne scai si vous avez toute l'assemblee<sup>96</sup> des monosyllabes. L'ordre ny fait rien ce qui est ecrit, est ecrit, ce qui est imprime est imprime. il n'importe de la prestance des lettres alphabetiq: faites comme il vous plaira ma diligenza el nome di Pompignan tout au long comptez que ce pompignan est honni a la cour et a la ville.

F. J. CROWLEY

University of California at Los Angeles

## (TO BE CONTINUED)

90. Marmontel tells of seeing L'Ecluse at Ferney in May 1760. Cf. *Mémoires*, Paris, 1804, p. 230. Le Sieur L'Ecluse, a "chirurgien-dentiste" and former actor came in 1760 to look after Madame Denis' teeth. Cf. Moland, *XLII*, 148, 180, 184-185, and 190.

91. Since the *Quand* appeared in April 1760, we have thus an approximate date. Cf. Moland, *XXIV*, III n.

92. *La Pucelle*. Bengesco lists a 1760 edition. Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, III, 305; I, 131, 485.

93. *Histoire de l'empire de Russie sous Pierre le Grand* (1759-1763).

94. *La Pucelle*. The first edition acknowledged by Voltaire was that of 1762. Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, III, 305; I, 131. The figure would be à propos because of Charles VII.

95. One of the polemical writings directed at Pompignan (May 1760). Cf. Moland, *x*, 561 and *XL*, 402. Jean Jacques Lefranc, marquis de Pompignan (1709-1784) who was ridiculed by Voltaire for his speech of acceptance of membership before the French Academy in March 1760.

96. In the *Recueil des facéties parisiennes pour les six premiers mois de l'an 1760* we find one section entitled "L'Assemblée des monosyllabes." Cf. Bengesco, *op. cit.*, II, 374 ff. Grimm, in the *Correspondance littéraire* (éd. Tourneux), IV, 303, says: "C'est sous ce titre que M. de Voltaire a fait ramasser tous les petits écrits occasionnés par le discours de M. Le Franc de Pompignan."

## ON THE ORIGIN OF FRENCH WORD-ORDER

THE PROBLEM of the difference between the word-order of Latin and that of Romance (or, more precisely, of French) is twofold: on the one hand, the customary Latin arrangement is subject, object, verb, while that of modern French is subject, verb, object; on the other hand, a French sentence is made up of word-groupings which are fixed and cannot be altered, while such groups are rare in Latin. It is clear,<sup>1</sup> furthermore, that the usual modern French word-order was a matter of slow evolution which, though not completely accounted for, can easily be followed through the history of Old French; while, on the other hand, it is useless to seek its direct source in any stage of Latin; in other words, before the ninth century.<sup>2</sup>

Professor Grandgent states in his *Introduction to Vulgar Latin* (§51) that "by the fourth century the new" [*i.e.* Romance, or French] "order prevailed," and cites a passage from the *Peregrinatio*, and another from the Vulgate: "Cui respondit Dominus: Qui peccaverit mihi delebo eum de libro meo; tu autem vade et duc populum istum quo locutus sum tibi; angelus meus praecedet te. Ego autem in die ultionis visitabo et hoc peccatum eorum." (*Exodus*, xxxii, 33-34). But it is clear that this order is exceptional in all *bona fide* Vulgar Latin texts down to the eighth century, practically as it was in earlier times; in fact, this order is characteristic neither of Latin nor of French, as is shown by the position of the determinatives and pronouns. Even in the seventh century, the order of the components of the new future (*ire habeo* > *irai*) is good evidence of the fact that Classical word-order is still prevalent; so is the order of words in the Oaths of Strasbourg.

The oldest French texts of the ninth and tenth centuries, like the Vulgar Latin texts of the eighth, show a preponderance of this so-called Latin word-order; but this is gradually replaced by a preponderance of the modern until, by the fifteenth century, the Latin order, or orders, have well-nigh disappeared.

The difference between the Classical word-order and that of the Vulgar writers of the Merovingian period lies in the absence from the

1. Cf. Foulet, *Petite Syntaxe de l'ancien français*, 3rd ed., p. 306.

2. As most scholars do; e.g., Elise Richter, *Zur Entwicklung der romanischen Wortstellung aus der Lateinischen*, Halle, 1903.

latter of the stylistic combinations based on quantitative rhythm, and especially in the disappearance of the *clausulae*. The Merovingian writers emphatically do not write Ciceronian Latin.

This is a negative evolution. Classical quantity having disappeared, the style that is based on it disappears also. In Medieval Latin, after Charlemagne, a system of *clausulae* based on accent continued, on another plane, the defunct Classical rhythm.<sup>3</sup>

Between the two, and indifferent to these stylistic developments, the Vulgar texts of the Merovingian period show us little of this interest in rhythm, but, as we shall endeavor to point out, we may nevertheless perceive in them the first elements of Romance rhythm. This has to do with the fixed order of words, which is a capital phenomenon in the last period of the history of Latin, from the sixth to the eighth century.

This fixed order of words, which distinguishes at first glance the Romance languages, and especially French, from Latin, is essentially based on the necessary coupling, in a certain order, of various words, generally the determined with the determinative, or the predicate with the predicated; for instance, the article, demonstrative or other determinative, with the noun; the auxiliary with the participle; the subject or object with the verb.

When a language has a sufficient number of fixed connections, it is characterized by what may be called the "fixed order" of words, a term which is not to be taken absolutely, any more than its counterpart, the "free order," which is more characteristic of Latin.

The following examples will illustrate this freedom of order of Latin: *Gaii Inst. Comment. I*, §114: "Potest autem coemptionem facere mulier, non solum cum marito suo sed etiam cum extraneo."

*Formula*: "Hunc ego hominem ex jure quirritium meum esse aio isque mihi emptus est hoc aere aeneaque libra."

§125: "Nec enim ratio patitur ut peregrinae homo condicionis civem Romanum in potestate habeat."

§150: "Titiae uxori meae tutoris optionem do."

I have quoted exclusively from the juriconsults because of the genuine and plain Latin spirit of their language.

Free order does not mean confusion or anarchy, any more than fixed order means rigidity. It evidently corresponds to a certain linguistic psychology, just as the fixed order corresponds to our own. It is not, however, the purpose of this article to discuss this aspect of the ques-

3. Cf. Mathieu G. Nicolau, *L'Origine du "cursus" rythmique et les débuts de l'accent d'intensité en latin*, Paris, 1930. The transition from the one to the other is natural enough.



tion. First, the historical facts concerning the ways and nature of the change from one order to the other must be ascertained.

It has often been noticed that Classical Latin usually contained the germs of future Romance developments. Already in Latin, the preposition was true to its name, and directly preceded the word whose relation it expressed. Exceptions are archaisms without any importance. The interrogative or relative pronoun also regularly preceded the noun ("Quae mens tam dira . . . impulit," *Aeneid*, II, 519).

Such is the situation at the beginning of the intermediate period, which I have called that of Vulgar Latin because it is marked by the triumph of the speech of the *vulgus*.

The new and decisive advance toward the fixed order of Romance is connected with the innovation of the frequent use of the demonstrative, culminating in the creation of the article.

Mr. George Trager<sup>4</sup> has shown how, by the sixth century, the use of the demonstrative adjective had grown, in many cases, into a sort of syntactical accentuation, whereby this demonstrative (*ille* or *ipse*) did not point out an object, but simply emphasized it.

This phenomenon corresponded, in my opinion, to the phonetic accentuation which had brought about a stress-accent in the place of the former musical accent. This emphasis was evidently a vulgar phenomenon, and it is from this emphatic use of the demonstrative that the article developed.

From the sixth to the ninth century, the use of the demonstrative adjective, both with its regular meaning and with the new connotation, goes on increasing. A cursory glance over representative texts of this period will definitely confirm and illustrate this statement.

The evidence in this respect differs, of course, with the nature of the texts. The demonstrative is equivalent to a gesture, called or uncalled for. Texts in which concrete objects are not mentioned, and which are of a more historical or abstract nature, do not contain it to the same degree as texts which deal with specific objects.

Taking as our point of departure the *Peregrinatio*, which, with some philologists, we date in the sixth century, and which in its use of the demonstrative is, as Trager observes, evidently a sixth-century text, we find that the *Peregrinatio* contains 64 examples of the demonstrative in the course of 275 lines,<sup>5</sup> whereas the sixth book of the *Historia Fran-*

4. *The Use of the Latin Demonstrative (especially ille and ipse) up to 600 A. D. as the Source of the Romance Article*, New York, 1932 (Columbia dissertation).

5. Cf. text in the *Chrestomathy of Vulgar Latin*, by H. F. Muller and P. Taylor, Boston, 1933.

*corum* of Gregory of Tours, which is of a historical nature, offers only 35 occurrences in 1230 lines; note that these two works may be considered as belonging approximately to the same period.

One century later, the texts of the royal documents present 55 cases in 128 lines, about twice as many as the *Peregrinatio*, with which they can be compared from the point of view of concreteness.<sup>6</sup>

The comparison is still more striking between the Rule of St. Benedict and that of Chrodegang. In the former, *ca.* 550, there are only 3 occurrences of the demonstrative adjective in 115 lines; in the latter, *ca.* 750, we have 39 cases in 39 lines.<sup>7</sup>

The *Liber Historiae Francorum*, *ca.* 730, has about four times as many occurrences of the demonstrative adjective as the *Historia Francorum* of Gregory (*ca.* 580) in a passage of almost equal length.<sup>8</sup>

The *Liber Historiae Francorum*, precisely because it is of a learned character, presents an interesting picture of what is going on at this period (*ca.* 730) with respect to the use of the demonstrative. In the famous incident of the Soissons vase, a comparison with Gregory is instructive. Whereas in the latter's work, *ille* as an adjective is used but once with *urceus* (vase), when Clovis strikes dead the insolent soldier who broke the vase at the division of the spoils ("Sic, inquit, tu Sexonas in *urceo illo* fecisti"),<sup>9</sup> in the *Liber* we have six uses of this emphatic *ille*, four of which are postposed:

"Remigius deprecans ut si aliis vasis ecclesiae recipere non meretur, vel *illo urceo* reddere juberet." (The *urceus* has not been mentioned before, but it stands out as of peculiar interest: *the* vase.) . . . "Haec audiens rex ait ad missos (Remigii) . . . : Cumque *urceus ille* in partem venerit, rogo vos ut mihi dare *istum urceum* non negetis. . . . Haec rege dicente, *illi* Franci qui bono animo fuerunt aiunt. . . . (But one insolent soldier) . . . percussit *urceo illo*." . . . (The following year, Clovis) . . . venit ad *hominem illum* qui . . . *urceum* percusserat . . . (and strikes him dead). . . . "Sic tu . . . in *urceo illo* fecisti!"

But already in the eighth century a new development is apparent which marks the beginning of the new advance toward a fixed word-order. In stereotyped constructions, when the demonstrative has no emphatic value, it always precedes the noun: *in illo tempore*;<sup>10</sup> *in illis temporibus*;<sup>9</sup> *in illis diebus*.<sup>10</sup> Never is it placed after the noun, as was

6. MGH. SRM, I, 27.

7. MGH. SRM, I, 252 ff.

8. *Op. cit.*, p. 242, 274, 277, 294, 325.

9. Page 288.

10. *Op. cit.*, p. 250, 279, 282, 301.

frequently the case formerly;<sup>11</sup> and whether it is *is*, *hic*, or *ille* (and they are often used), their position is fixed before the noun.

The statistics of the *Liber* are most instructive: leaving out of consideration the stereotyped expressions mentioned above (*in illo*, *eo*, *hoc tempore*), *ille*, always emphatic, follows the noun in 25 cases out of 33. Out of the 8 cases in which it precedes we have: "tota illa terra vastata" (toute la terre dévastée) (page 253); in another case the article value is evident: "Equo vero quem illos matricolarios datis centum soledis pro ipso equo ut eum reciperet . . . ;" the *matricolarii* (the poor of the church) have not been mentioned before. Also: "Ipse fluvijs de corporibus mortuorum repletus illa aqua (the water) currere non valeret" (page 307).

Thus a functional value is being given to word-order: in the extreme cases of non-demonstrative value and unaccented demonstrative function, the demonstrative always precedes; in the extreme cases of demonstrative emphasis, it always follows. And this is the condition about the year 730.

The reason is that the use of the demonstrative as a syntactical accent of the noun, to use Trager's expression, gives it a secondary accent in regard to this noun similar to the accent on the initial syllable of a polysyllabic word; and this because it is, in fact, a secondary accent of the noun. This order is thus fixed by the rhythm evolving from the triumphant progress of stress-accent.

This phenomenon is comparatively recent, for in the *Peregrinatio* (ca. 540) the demonstrative adjective, even in its most evident article-like new development, will follow the noun just like the demonstrative in its usual function: "tenens manibus levatis epistolam ipsam" (page 127.1); "ad columnam illam" (page 132.14); "tenet . . . cornu illud" (page 133.13). Not only is the position unsettled, but still more strikingly, it may be separated from the noun by another word, in accordance with the freer order of Latin: "orationes etiam ipsae" (page 130.15); "quae orationes et ipsae" (page 134).<sup>5</sup>

In Gregory, the same rule holds true: "culpabilis ille" (vi, 8); "homines illos" (*ibid.*, 22); "comes ille" (*ibid.*, 24). In fact, in Gregory (ca. 590), the position of the adjective is still fairly evenly divided before and after the noun. Of particular interest in this connection is the fact that the populations of Rumania, which preserved their communications with the west until the sixth century, when the position of

11. Cf. Vulgate, *Isaiae*, xx, 2, etc.: "in tempore illo"; *Matth.*, iii, 1: "in diebus autem illis," "in diebus illis" (*Marc.*, viii, 1; *A. A.*, vi, 1).

the article-demonstrative was not yet fixed, later selected a positional development which runs counter to that of the west.

But although the separation between the demonstrative and the noun is frequent in Gregory ("ipso quoque in loco," v, 39; "in ipsis, sicut regeneratus fuerat, albis obiit," II, 29), yet what may be called the hardening process appears; in the very frequent expression *hoc anno* (> OF *oan, ouan*), the order is settled. The presence of an intervening word is rare indeed: "*hoc vero anno*" (VI, 43).

Finally, by the end of the seventh century, the noun had fixed its syntactical accent, consisting of this pre-article demonstrative, in its normal position directly before it: "*ad ipso monasthrii fuerat concessa*"; "*ipsi agentis memorato Drogone*"; "*ipse Drogus*"; "*ipsa villa*"; "*de ipso Magnoaldo*"; "*ipsi Magnoaldus*"; "*apud ipso Berechario*"; "*nec de ipsa curte*"; "*ipsi Berecharius*"; "*ipsi agentis*"; "*ipsius vero Drogone*"; "*apud ipso Magnoaldo*"; "*illa fructa*" (Lauer and Samaran, page 19, *an.* 697).

This being the case, when *ille* is used as a more emphatic form than *ipse*, which is often the case at this period (end of the seventh and beginning of the eighth century), it generally follows the noun, since postposition has an emphatic value which confers upon the demonstrative the main accent instead of the secondary one in the group.<sup>12</sup>

What the later texts of the eighth century show is the transfer of *ille* to the prepositive position. This we find definitely established in the *Regula Chrodegangi* (ca. 750): "*Illa media pars cleri qui seniores fuerint annis singulis accipiant cappas novas. . . . Et illa alia medietas cleri illas veteres cappas quas illi senioris annis singulis reddunt accipiant et illi seniores illas cappas quas reddere debent non commutent.*"<sup>13</sup>

Note in this connection that, as a syntactical accent, *ipse* appeared at first to have greater chances than the regular demonstrative *ille* of becoming the forefather of the Romance article; a few Romance dialects (Sardinian, Majorcan, etc.) have indeed adopted it. It seemed better adapted to the purpose because it was, even in Classical times, an emphasizing word. *Ille*, however, had a demonstrative value which must have given it an advantage, since it appears clearly that the nearest step to the article was first attained in connection with physical objects, as shown by the titles of the Tardif documents and the *Regula Chrodegangi*.

12. *MGH. SRM*, II, 257: "*cum esset sero die illa*"; "*quando simul nuptiale accumbere deberent.*" The Latin poetry of the Middle Ages preserved this meaning and word-order: "*Dies irae, dies illa*"; "*Dies illa, dies irae—calamitatis et miseriae*" (Office of the Dead).

What evidently happened in France was that *ipse* gave up to *ille* what little demonstrative value it may have had, preserving only the emphasizing character in which we find it specialized in the oldest French documents: "ciel eps (*ipse*) nun avret Evrun" (*Saint Léger*, 56); "Paschas furent in eps cel di" (that very day—*ibid.*, 80).

This development, with the reenforcement of *iste*, also took place in Italian (*stesso*), while Spanish *ese*, on the contrary, shows the development of the demonstrative value of *ipse*.

The reenforcement of the emphatic value of *ille* in the postposition is quite apparent in the substantive value which it has in some legal uses, equivalent to the *Titius*, *Maevius*, etc. (John Doe) of the Classical legal usage in the formulas: "germanus suos illi" (*Formulae Andecavenses*) (so-and-so, *un tel*); "ille venerabile lui" (*Formulae Marculfi*),<sup>13</sup> etc.

On the other hand, as we advance into the eighth century, the demonstrative tends to precede the noun at all times. This is the case in the *Formulae*, the original royal documents of Tardif and of Lauer and Samaran,<sup>14</sup> in the original lives of the saints: *Vita Vedastis*, *Vita Eufroniae*, *Vita Wandregisili*, in the *Polyptyque d'Irminon*.

In this connection, the evolution of *iste* is interesting. *Iste* has become by now the emphatic demonstrative with the meaning of "this," the normal one still being *hic*, *haec*, *hoc*. Accordingly, *iste* follows the noun four times out of the six checked in pages 238-326, for evidently, in the new group thus formed it has the main accent;<sup>15</sup> on the other hand, *hic*, *haec*, *hoc* precede the noun 30 times and follow it only twice.<sup>16</sup>

In the second half of the eighth century, the clearly exceptional and emphatic value of *iste*, already evident in the *Liber*, is brought out by its temporary postposition and concurrent use with *hic* in some striking cases. Pei cites in the documents after 750: "hanc donatione ista" (= cette donation que voici; no. 59); "contra hanc epistola donationis ista" (no. 68). No such case is found in the preceding group of docu-

13. *Chrestomathy*, pp. 190, 193.

14. Cf. Mario A. Pei, *The Language of the Eighth-Century Texts in Northern France*, p. 198: "Only one case of *ille* following the noun against hundreds when it precedes" (no. 45: "farinario illo"), and also one case in the *Vita Eufroniae*: "nullus cognoscat secretum hunc": very emphatic, for it is the secret that this supposed monk is a woman.

15. E.g., Chlothildis, indignant that a poor man should have been deprived of his bag: "Quis tullit pauperi istius saccolum suum?" (*MGH. SRM*, II, p. 255).

16. The difference between this numbering and that of P. Taylor, *Todd Memorial Volumes*, II, 209, is due to the fact that I have already taken out of count expressions of time: *eo tempore*, *illo tempore*, *illis diebus*, etc., in which the demonstrative always precedes.

ments (there is, however, a gap between 717 and 750). It is clearly a new development.<sup>17</sup>

This appears definitely to settle the position of the ordinary demonstrative in all its values down to its article-like function in front of the noun. The function of *iste* in postposition, exceptional and temporary in French, will survive in Spanish: *el hombre este*; and, by analogy, *el hombre ese*. But for the early French period, the trend is in the other direction, and emphasis will be obtained by other means so far as the demonstrative is concerned; for instance, by the prefixing of *ecce*, although the actual combination of the two demonstratives *hic* and *iste*, which are separated in the above examples, cannot be considered as out of the question.<sup>18</sup>

After 800, the Carolingian Capitularies continue the movement described above, and this in spite of the return to a better Latinity which the Carolingian Renaissance had brought about.

It may here be remarked that this development, which also took place in Italy, was slower there than in France. Thus, while *ipse* had regularly preceded the noun in France since the end of the seventh century, the *Capitularia Italica* (776-781) present it still equally distributed before and after the noun.<sup>19</sup> The contrast is indeed striking.

But soon after, from 782 to 786,<sup>20</sup> the assimilation with Frankish documents is completed in this respect. This, by the way, is a clear indication of the important consequences that the inclusion of the Kingdom of Italy in the Frankish empire under Charles' son Pippin will have on the making of Italian.<sup>21</sup>

After 800, the effects of the Carolingian Renaissance somewhat blur the picture, and make it more difficult to ascertain such intrusions of the *lingua rustica* into the written texts. Yet there is a difference between the texts in this respect. Those which have the character of docu-

17. In the *Formulae Andecavenses* we find also: "contra hanc cessione istam"; "haec cessio ista" (*Chrestomathy*, p. 89). These *Formulae* were composed in the sixth century, but the above feature is evidently a late one and contemporaneous with the date of the *MS* (eighth century) rather than with that of the composition. This shows that the collection of *Formulae* must be linguistically interpreted with the greatest care.

18. Cf. Pei, "Old French Demonstratives," *Language*, XII, 47-51; Tuttle, "French *icil*," *Modern Language Review*, XXXII, 83; Pei, "French *icil*," *Modern Language Review*, XXXIII, 260-261.

19. *MGH, Leg. Sect.*, II, 1.

20. *Ibid.*, no. 91.

21. This kingdom extended south toward the line from Lucca to the mouth of the Reno, although theoretically it claimed suzerainty over the whole peninsula. Cf. also *Vita Wandregisili*: "Bobius in regione Langobardorum qui dicitur Italia" (*MGH. SRM*, v, 10).



ments to be read aloud (possibly in Romance from the Latin), or are of such an urgent nature as almost to preclude the normal pomposity of the schoolman, clearly mark progress in these new features.

Already in the latter half of the eighth century, the new demonstrative possessive, *illorum* (*eorum*, *ipsorum*), replacing *suus* when the possessor is plural, and not sporadically, but consistently used in this function, appears to become attracted to the position before the noun.<sup>22</sup> Before the death of Charlemagne, the progress in the pre-position of *illorum* is manifest. In no. 58 we find: "servi eorum cartas ostendant," which is the plural of "servus suam cartam propriam probare debeat." And also: "de servis qui Francas feminas accipiunt et postea illorum domini eis cartas faciunt." In no. 73 (811),<sup>23</sup> which is a short capitulary in ten paragraphs, out of eleven cases of the possessive *illorum* only two are placed after the noun: "abbates et eorum (for *sui*) advocati potestatem non habeant de eorum tonsis clericis . . . similiter et comites de eorum pagensis non habeant potestatem," etc.

The more urgent and direct the capitulary is, the more settled this order appears to be: in no. 84 (813)<sup>24</sup> we find: "ut episcopi habeant potestatem in eorum parochia . . . providendum est episcopis in eorum parochiis." No. 151<sup>24</sup> of the Capitularies (825) presents in 25 lines all of its eleven cases of *illorum* or *eorum* (for *suus*) before the noun, and not a single case of post-position.

Note that for the same period, the Italian documents are not so advanced (and, in regard to *illorum* > *loro*, will never be). In no. 165 (825), although the demonstrative precedes in every case, *illorum's* position is divided almost equally, four after, three before the noun. This is eminently in accord with the later development of Italian, in which *loro* definitely joins the possessives in the matter of position, and is indifferently used to the present day either before or after the noun (*il loro libro*, *il libro loro*).

As the years go by, the possessive itself is attracted into this fixed grouping in the French documents. In no. 187,<sup>24</sup> the eight possessive adjectives appearing in the first 38 lines all precede the noun, while the three possessives appearing in the last 20 lines all follow; the possessive *illorum* precedes the noun in the section where the possessive precedes,

22. Ph. Lauer and Ch. Samaran, *Les Diplômes originaux des Mérovingiens*, p. 19 ff.: "per eorum consensu"; "de eorum capite"; "per eorum agros," "de eorum homines"; "nec eorum necuciantes," etc., vs. only three postposit examples: "per villas eorum"; "vel agros eorum"; "de homines eorum."

23. *MGH, Leg. Sect.*, II, 1.

24. *Ibid., Leg. Sect.*, II, 2.



and follows where the possessive follows (three cases of each). The demonstrative, on the other hand, invariably precedes, even in document no. 1941 (*Regni Divisio*), which belongs to the restored style of the imperial chancery.

In no. 196 (829), which is a *Relatio* of the Bishops to the Emperor, the possessive *illorum* precedes the noun in every case: VII, "propter eorum avaricia"; VIII, "de presbiteris et eorum ecclesiis"; XVI, "alii praelati in eorum parrochiis," "eorum prava exempla," "propter eorum incuriam," etc. There are twelve cases in all.

But no. 197, which is an official account, by the Bishops, of Louis' penance at Compiègne in 833, and a self-accusation by the Emperor in great style, is couched in a sort of Ciceronian rhythm.

In regard to the order of words, the Oaths of Strasbourg continue and confirm this evolution: demonstrative and possessive always precede.<sup>25</sup> In fact, to my knowledge, no case of a postposed demonstrative, and hardly any case of a postposed possessive, is to be found in French.<sup>26</sup>

The principle of fixed word-order is thus strongly anchored in important groups of determinatives and nouns, and not only entrenched, but growing; it had been growing since the end of the sixth century; it is a living principle which will tend to expand more and more.

It is evidently based on a relation of secondarily accented with primarily accented words, the former naturally preceding the latter. The disappearance of such intervening particles as *etiam*, *autem*, *ergo*, etc.,<sup>27</sup> is both a contributory cause and an effect of this new system. The general cause seems to be the triumph and expansion of accentuation in all its forms: phonetic, morphological and syntactic.

By 800 A.D., the demonstrative and the future article were one and the same word, and it was only a question of function, often very hard to tell apart (OF *li mon pedre*, the one of my father; Sp. *el de mi padre*), sometimes to this very day (*parler de la sorte*).

A morphological value had been attached to the position of the

25. This order is well established, and Latin documents of similar import normally display it: no. 205 (851): "ut nemo suo pari suum regnum aut suos fideles . . . discipiat aut fors consiliat"; "nostri fideles . . . et illorum . . . communi consilio . . . sicut per rectum unusquisque in suo ordine et statu suo principi et suo seniore esse debet," etc.; although as time goes on, the written Latin texts lose their value as reflecting Romance phenomena.

26. *Et qui avra armeüres soies propres, si s'en arme* = et qui habet (arma) armetur et armis suis (*Alexandre in prose*, Hilka, p. 56); Ja nel retenez maugré suen (*Perceval*, 8342); Lez moi vos couchiez an cest lit/Qu'il est assez lez a oés nos (*ibid.*, 2054).

27. "Ipsa etiam civitas" (*Pereg.*, *Chrest.*, p. 125); "ipsa autem die" (*ibid.*, p. 134); "tua ergo fraternitas" (*Greg. the Great*, p. 14). These particles disappear in the eighth century and are completely discarded in the original texts of that period.

demonstrative, and the accentuation had even begun to create special forms to be used respectively in a proclitic and in an independent or postnominal position. And, what is even more important, a new rhythm had been created which grouped words together in certain relations of secondarily and primarily accented units. This was, in fact, the new rhythm which was to take the place of the Latin rhythm.

The next step will be the extension of this system to the relation of personal pronoun and verb. This, of course, is a subsequent development and a purely Romance one, following, as it does, Charlemagne's Renaissance. How it connects with the results indicated here will form the subject of another study.

HENRI F. MULLER

*Columbia University*

## FERMEZ DONC VOTRE PORTE

MM. LE BIDOIS dans leur *Syntaxe du français moderne*, I, §337, traitent de l'emploi "stylistique" du possessif dans l'exemple ci-dessus. Ils n'admettent pas l'explication: *la porte que vous auriez dû fermer*. "Non, —disent-ils,—on n'en pense pas si long. Il paraît plus probable qu'en s'exprimant ainsi, on veut dire simplement: *Fermez donc la porte, vous!* De fait, c'est surtout à la personne qu'on en a, dans la circonstance; et sur elle porte tout le poids de la pensée, du sentiment. Par modération instinctive, on use du possessif au lieu du personnel (tant est grande l'aptitude du premier à se substituer au second!)."

Le sentiment des auteurs me semble excellent. Le possessif est un reproche atténué, puisqu'il n'ose pas se produire directement, mais choisit le chemin détourné de mettre en rapport l'objet sur lequel on veut que s'exerce une action (soit la porte qu'on veut fermée) avec une personne qui devrait l'exercer, sans laisser cette dernière s'avancer au premier plan. Dans une phrase comme: *fermez votre boutique*, le possessif indique l'intérêt qui pourrait induire une personne à protéger ce qui lui appartient; *fermez votre porte* suggère le même intérêt dans l'interlocuteur, même si cet intérêt n'est que supposé. On pourrait aussi expliquer le possessif par l'agacement produit par tout ce qui nous appartient, nous est accoutumé,<sup>1</sup> et, par conséquent, manque de sensa-

1. C'est la même nuance qui explique le possessif dans: *sa conversation . . . sentait son curé de campagne*, ce qui équivaut à "la conversation typique, usuelle d'un curé de campagne" (v. *Aufsätze zur romanischen Syntax und Stylistik*, no. 2; Sandfeld, 127). D'autre part, les sentiments de l'homme étant généralement ambivalents, il ne faut pas oublier que ce que nous possédons peut aussi être ce que nous chérissons; nous aurons donc, à côté du possessif "agacé," le possessif "de tendresse." On voit la force isolatrice de l'amour, cet accaparement des choses par l'être aimant, dans des passages comme ceux-ci: Maurois, *Le Cercle de famille*, p. 75:

"—Tu ne vas pas me faire un peu de musique? . . . Tu ne veux pas me jouer ton prélude?"

Pour Mme d'Hocquinvillle, Chopin n'avait écrit qu'un Prélude,—et il était devenu *ton* Prélude parce qu'elle l'associait à sa petite fille."

Morand, *France-la-douce*, p. 55 (c'est un professeur de "psychologie française pour les candidats à la naturalisation" qui parle):

"Railliez Paris, comme tout le monde, mais que vos louanges aillent à la province. Exprimez-vous avec liberté sur le fromage à la pie ou le livarot, mais pas sur *leur* brie, le brie tricolore!" (souligné dans le texte; cf. aussi Sandfeld, *Syntaxe du français contemporain*, I, 202).

*Ton*, *leur* dans ces exemples sont devenues égaux à *ton (leur) cher*. . . Une intimité est exprimée aussi par le démonstratif, plus fort que l'article, puisque montrer quelque chose à quelqu'un crée une atmosphère de communauté: p. ex. *comment va cette santé?* (=esp. ¿cómo va esa salud?) ou Maurois, (*op. cit.*, p. 269: Au téléphone:)"Allô! C'est

tionnel: *vosre porte*, devient quelque chose comme *vosre sacrée porte*. Nous sommes ici en présence de ce que je voudrais appeler un *possessif polémique*. Dans Sandfeld, *Syntaxe du français contemporain*, I, 202, on trouve des exemples où l'interlocuteur auquel on a adressé un possessif polémique, repousse la polémique en faisant semblant de comprendre le possessif vraiment comme un possessif:

(Vautel): Et que devient votre Cousinet?—Mon Cousinet? *Mais personne ne m'en a fait cadeau.*

Evidemment, le possessif polémique implique, comme toute polémique ou caricature, un grossissement des dimensions de l'objet visé: on élargit l'appartenance momentanée en une possession durable par le possessif. La porte qui n'est 'mienne' que pendant que je l'ouvre devient soudain une porte pour ainsi dire éternellement mienne.

Ce que je voudrais marquer ici, c'est que le français montre des amorces d'un phénomène qu'on trouve plus développé dans d'autres langues, précisément le *possessif polémique*, qui s'introduit parce que le sujet parlant se trouve en humeur batailleuse ou rancunière, sans même qu'un agent quelconque, qui pourrait condescendre à ses désirs, soit en question. C'est le cas du danois *dit b st*='votre b te!', au lieu de: 'vous b te, b te que vous  tes!' On peut observer en anglais la gen se du ph nom ne. Je tire mes exemples du roman am ricain de Santayana, *The Last Puritan* (New York, 1937):

I was sown illegitimate, but I was reaped legitimate. . . . Never quite myself except with my mother, like *your* true bastard [= 'jamais moi-m me, comme le vrai b tard'] (page 265).

[Un jeune homme parle—ou plut t pense comme s'il parlait d'un camarade:] . . . By gad, you'll have to find your own way to the temple of Wenus [*sic*]. I'm no pander or court chamberlain to be arranging secret interviews for his Royal Highness. No need of warning me to keep off. *Your* virtuous chap may be lovely at home or singing in College's Chapel. . . . *Your* muff doesn't want to hunt in pairs='le vertueux gar on, le b ta.' [Le *you* de la premi re phrase repr sente un autre personnage, fictif celui-l , que le *your* s'adressant par prosopop e au camarade] (page 268).

[Un "Eton boy" dit:] M'Tutor says, too, that the reason why Eton and Win-

vous, mon ch ri? Alors, cette Bourse?"—"cette Bourse" dont nous avons tant parl , dont nos pens es   nous deux s'occupent tant, etc. Sandfeld (*op. cit.*, p. 246)  num re plusieurs exemples avec d monstratif "dans des interrogations (souvent elliptiques) pour s'informer d'une chose dont il a  t  parl ." L'ellipse est pour ainsi dire contrebalanc e par le d monstratif, ou plut t le d monstratif cr e tant d'intimit  que la phrase enti re n'est plus n cessaire. Le d monstratif peut d'ailleurs, pr cis ment parce qu'il fait appel   du connu, du d j  vu, trahir une nuance d'agacement parall le   celle du possessif. Cf. Cette phrase de Giraudoux, *La Guerre de Troie n'aura pas lieu*, p. 101: "Vous allez nous la fermer, cette porte?" (dit la pacifiste H cube au po te belliciste Demokos en parlant de la porte de la Paix).

chester are inimitable, is because Henry the Sixth and William of Wickham were saints, and now up in heaven they keep praying for all us boys. . . . But, you see when *your* Harrow or Rugby bounders are going to blazes, there are no saints in heaven to care a damn . . . to mark intercession [*Le your* est motivé par le *you see*] (page 301).

The old Calvinists, Oliver felt, hadn't been puritan enough. . . . *Your* hard-boiled moralists were idolaters, worshipping their own fancies and hypnotized by their own words [*Your* s'adresse à un public imaginaire auquel parle le solitaire Oliver] (page 318).

On me rappelle le passage de *Hamlet* dans la scène des fossoyeurs: "Cudgel thy brains no more about it, for *your dull ass* will not mend his pace with beating." (*Thy* fait voir que *you* s'adresse à une pluralité, à un public qui connaît par expérience la nature de l'âne. Schlegel-Tieck traduisent: "*der dumme Esel*").

Cet exemple peut donner une idée de la genèse de l'expression: *your ass* est vraiment 'votre âne, l'âne que vous possédez'; le proverbe renvoie à une expérience vérifiable par *vous*, le voisin ou prochain.

Le *your* s'adresse à une communauté imaginaire (comme *you* dans "it gives *you* an impression of horror," cf. fr.: "cela *vous* donne une impression . . ." avec un pronom que les grammairiens déclarent identique avec *one*, *on*). Même dans le célèbre passage de *Hamlet*:

*There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,  
Than are dreamed of in your philosophy,*

le possessif, qui pourtant s'adresse à Horatio, a une nuance polémique, et Horatio n'est que le représentant d'un groupe plus large ayant une certaine 'philosophie' (l'édition folio de 1623 a d'ailleurs *our philosophy*). Mon ami et collègue H. C. Lancaster me dit que l'acteur doit appuyer sur le mot *philosophy* dans le passage de *Hamlet*, car, en accentuant *your*, il s'adresserait à Horatio seul: on voit par là que le possessif polémique a, au moins en anglais, une existence phonétique différente du possessif "possessif" ou possessif tout court. Pour des exemples, voir Poutsma, *Grammar of Late Modern English*, II B, p. 877, qui attribue à ce possessif une valeur plus nettement dépréciative qu'appréciative et qui donne des exemples couvrant les siècles depuis Shakespeare jusqu'à G. Eliot. Franz, *Shakespeare-Grammatik* donne aussi beaucoup plus d'exemples dépréciatifs qu'appréciatifs. Ce possessif est d'ailleurs en anglais un procédé plutôt littéraire.

Dans les cas péjoratifs, on suppose un adversaire fictif qu'on rend responsable—en s'adressant à lui par le possessif—des mauvaises choses ou des mauvais caractères qu'on se plaît à morigéner. Dans le cas de la

porte laissée ouverte, il y avait au moins un véritable adversaire du moment, auquel on pouvait s'adresser pour remédier à la situation malencontreuse pour nous—mais, dans les cas anglais, nous associons l'interlocuteur à notre sentiment désagréable. Pourquoi? parce qu'il est très humain de s'en prendre à *quelqu'un*. On dira: pourquoi ne pas se prendre aux véritables coupables (soit dans nos exemples aux individus nommés *true bastard*, *virtuous chap*, *muff* etc.); pourquoi chercher, par le *your*, des complices? C'est que les véritables coupables sont peut-être loin; nous voulons des coupables à notre portée, soit l'interlocuteur, soit un public imaginaire, apostrophés par le possessif. C'est que, dans tout état affectif, l'homme a un profond besoin de communication, par la parole, avec son prochain (prochain au sens local et moral!), un besoin de solidarité humaine au moment même où il se désolidarise d'autres hommes. Par le possessif on se chamaille un peu avec celui qui vous écoute en l'intéressant à un jugement prononcé sur autrui, mais, au fond, le possessif polémique est moins une arme qui doit blesser, qu'une main tendue implorant la charité de l'assentiment. On pourrait aussi admettre un possessif indiquant que le sujet du discours est *connu* à l'interlocuteur (cf. le cas *your ass*). Mais alors, on emploierait aussi la ruse d'intéresser le partenaire en supposant—peut-être à faux—des rapports existant déjà avec le sujet dont on parle.

J'ai connu un vieux professeur allemand qui, lorsqu'il racontait quoi que ce soit au sujet de mon ancien maître Meyer-Lübke, disait toujours: *Votre ami Meyer-Lübke*, à une époque où il savait très bien que nous n'étions plus amis: c'était une façon de m'intéresser à son récit, de me taquiner un peu, de déverser sa mauvaise humeur au sujet de Meyer-Lübke et de moi; c'était une polémique à plusieurs tranchants, peut-être une polémique contre la vie entière qui fait et défait les amitiés—mais dans l'attitude grincheuse perçait aussi une pointe d'humour conciliant, offrant sa propre amitié taquine à mon maître ainsi qu'à moi-même.

Dire *bête que tu es* à son prochain est très direct, très simple, très grossier—on est vite arrivé au bout. Dire *ta bête* comme en danois, c'est user d'un procédé plus "long," plus indirect, plus raffiné, en intéressant au moment de l'injure l'être injurié même à notre attaque ("la bête dont tu sais quelque chose," etc.), en se solidarissant *humainement* avec lui par le possessif, tant il est vrai qu'au moment de l'agression nous sommes faibles et que, par une complication paradoxale de notre être, nous *avons besoin* de l'homme que nous voulons blesser. Il y a de la civilité et de la politesse dans cette forme de l'injure mitigée. Peut-être



y a-t-il aussi un désir obscur d'introduire plus de réalité, par le possessif implorant le témoignage d'autrui, dans l'irréel que comporte l'injure, généralement très vague, très sommaire et renonçant à la précision: à qui ne dit-on pas "bête"? Voir là-dessus la conférence de M. Robert Musil, *Über die Dummheit* (Vienne, 1937)—qui d'ailleurs relève le "Zug von Leiden am Leidbringer," la souffrance de l'homme agressif qui injurie son prochain.

J'ai déjà prouvé dans *Aufsätze zur romanischen Syntax und Stilistik* que le port. *seu burro* = 'bête que tu es,' n'a rien à faire avec l'expression danoise à possessif, comme l'avait indiqué Tobler, mais que, comme l'esp. dialectal *so tunante* etc., il représente un *senior* (*senhor*, *señor* = 'monsieur'), lui aussi assez compliqué, puisque ce mot adoucit l'insulte grossière par la politesse ironique et, par l'ironie, rend l'insulte plus inattaquable, puisque polie.<sup>2</sup> Décidément, la langue ne procède pas unilatéralement—ni l'homme non plus. . . .

M. D. R. Fuchs, dans son article "Das obugrische deminutiv-suffix -n" (*Ylipainos Forschungenista*, Helsinki, 1938, xxvi, 26 ff.), prouve que ce suffixe à fonction déterminative des langues wogoule et ostyaque est à l'origine un pronom possessif de la deuxième personne: *osty, talon-xatl* 'jour d'hiver' signifie à l'origine 'le jour de ton hiver' > 'le jour de l'hiver.' Dans la même fonction déterminative apparaissent aussi les pronoms possessifs de la troisième personne du singulier (et peut-être aussi du pluriel) et de la première personne: *osty, sejem sem* 'grain de son sable' > 'grain du sable' > 'grain de sable.' Il compare cet usage des langues finno-ougriennes, qui exprime la détermination par un rapport de la chose ou de la personne qui est le sujet de la communication avec l'interlocuteur (ou un public) ou avec l'individu parlant ou avec les personnes dont on parle, au datif éthique des langues indo-européennes: le dialogue ostyaque 'L'autre femme [litt. ton autre femme], où est-elle allée?'—'L'autre femme [litt. mon autre femme], où devrait-elle aller?' trouverait son parallèle dans des expressions 'L'autre femme où t'est-elle allée?'—'L'autre femme où me devrait-elle aller?' Le pronom possessif dont nous avons traité plus haut est peut-

2. Je transcris ici un passage de l'essayiste autrichien A. Polgar, *Leitfaden für Polemiken*, qui nous apprend la portée insidieusement cruelle qu'a la politesse d'un "Monsieur" introduit dans une polémique: "Gebrauche zeitweilig (nicht konsequent, zeitweilig!) das Wort 'Herr,' wenn du zum oder vom Gegner sprichst. Also nicht: 'Kohn nennt mich einen Esel,' sondern: 'Herr Kohn nennt mich einen Esel.' Solches 'Herr' hat schon etwas Entkräftendes, leicht Höhnisches. Indem es ein Wort des Respekts setzt, wo der Respekt selbst offenbar fehlt, betont es dieses Fehlen in so unvergleichlich delikater wie entschiedener Art. Es hebt (im angeführten Beispiel) den Kohn und seine Behauptung gleichsam hoch . . . damit die Lächerlichkeit von beiden besser zu sehen sei."



être une analogie encore plus proche. Dans un passage comme (Céline, *Bagatelles pour un massacre*, p. 347: Qu'est-ce qu'on joue aujourd'hui en Russie?) "Les vieux dadas! tout bêtement! Leurs 'Carmen' . . . leurs 'Manon' . . . leurs 'Onéguine' . . . l'inévitable 'Dame': . . ." *leurs 'Carmen'* est évidemment égal à *l'inévitable 'Dame'* (ou plutôt = 'les inévitables représentations de la "Dame"') et nous sommes tout près du possessif déterminé à la ostyaque.

LEO SPITZER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

## REVIEWS

*L'Origine del dramma liturgico.* Da MARIA SOFIA DE VITO. Biblioteca della "Rassegna," XXI, 1938. Pp. 178.

It is the ardently defended thesis of this book that the liturgical drama developed out of the Roman liturgy alone, without the intervention of the famous paschal trope of Saint Gall, *Quem quaeritis in sepulchro, o Christicolae*. The thesis rests primarily upon the absence from certain dramatic texts, especially Italian texts, of phrases that the author regards as characteristic of the trope. It is also the author's view that at a time when the Church in Gaul very closely followed Roman usage, it would not have admitted extra-liturgical tropes into its offices and that these were only employed later, as embellishments, after the formative stage of the liturgical drama had been achieved. Signorina De Vito believes further that the *Regularis Concordia* of the tenth century, which contains our earliest account of the Easter play, describes a text that corresponds more closely with Italian than with French forms and hence with a primitive version antedating the use of the trope. Finally, in her opinion, it is the putative Roman origin of the drama, *i.e.* its birth uniquely in the antiphons and responsories of the Church, that accounts for the remarkable uniformity of our liturgical plays.

Plausible as these hypotheses may seem in themselves, they are unfortunately not supported by the facts. It is not, as the author assumes, the words *Christicolae, coelicolae, sicut praedixerat* and *nuntiate* (to which should have been added *in sepulchro, Nazarenum* and *ite*) that alone distinguish the Saint Gall trope from its liturgical and Biblical sources, but also the choice and combination of the various phrases adopted from different parts of the liturgy and Gospels to fashion the dialogue. If the dramatic texts that she cites in support of her theory were ignorant of the trope but evolved instead directly from the sources of the trope, how does it happen that they, like the trope, chose the same elements and arranged them in a similar pattern? And why have we over 400 manuscripts, among them our earliest, that betray the direct influence of the trope, but only a few, mostly late, that follow the conjectural pre-trope stage? Moreover, several of these supposedly primitive versions, despite our author's failure to realize this, show that they are variations of the trope and not independent derivatives of the liturgy and Bible: Parma's *sicut dixit* echoes the trope's *sicut praedixerat* (and the author omits the significant *et cetera* which follows this phrase), whereas in the texts of Cividale, Sutri, Aquileia, Gotha, Wurzburg, Châlons and Halberstadt, the words *o tremule mulieres* and *in hoc tumultu* are reworkings of the trope's *o Christicolae* and *in sepulchro*. Incidentally, the posited pre-trope formula given on page 142, which the author affirms to be found in a large number of texts, appears

in none. To a dispassionate observer, therefore, it seems far more likely that certain versions of the Easter play which occur in a few Italian and other manuscripts are abbreviations or variations of the well-known dramatic office based on the Saint Gall trope, rather than remnants of a hypothetical, pre-trope stage of that office, a stage, moreover, which in all essentials would have exactly corresponded to the trope stage.

The author's historical survey of the Church in Gaul and its extra-liturgical practices would have benefited by reference to Blume and Bannister's introduction to Dreves, *Analecta Hymnica*, vol. LIII, F. J. E. Raby's *History of Christian-Latin Poetry* (1927), pages 210-223 and H. F. Muller's "Prehistory of the Mediaeval Drama," in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XLIV (1924), 544-575. Karl Young in his *Drama of the Mediaeval Church* (1, 181) would have provided her with a lucid summary of the explanations that have been offered to account for the anomalous use of tropes at a time when the Carolingians presumably desired to purify the Church service-books. As for her conclusion that the *Regularis Concordia* attests a Roman, trope-less origin of the drama, this is hardly supported by the specific mention in that text of its use of the customs of Fleury and Ghent or by its textual reproduction of the third and most of the fourth verse of the Saint Gall trope.

Certain fundamental questions concerning the dissemination of the church plays are badly blurred in this study by the suggestion that the uniformity of our texts is to be explained by their derivation directly from the liturgy. Obviously, the use of the same antiphons and responsories by different plays contributes much to their uniformity. But the fundamental reason for their choice of the same liturgical materials—and non-liturgical materials as well—is ignored here. Why, for example, do so many Easter plays adopt the antiphon *Cito euntes*, derived from Matthew, with an addition of the words *et Petro* from Mark (cf. page 144)? Clearly, this procedure does not imply the independent use by various churches of a certain antiphon, but the borrowing by one church from another of an altered antiphon. Similarly, the sentence *Cernitis, o socii, ecce linteamina*, etc., probably composed directly for the drama and owing nothing to the *Liber Responsalis*, as the author admits (page 146), is found in many dramatic texts. This sentence, like many others that might be mentioned, can only have been obtained by one church directly from another. No one would deny—or has ever denied—the important role played by the liturgy in the expansion and development of the plays—the discovery of its extensive use is not our author's, as she would have us believe. The fact, however, that our plays are alike not only in selecting the same liturgical elements, but also in adopting the same non-liturgical additions is of even greater import, indicating, as it does, the direct connections that must have been obtained between various churches in the middle ages.<sup>1</sup> It is thus the continual

1. For a study of some of these connections see Edith A. Wright, *The Dissemination of the Liturgical Drama in France*, Bryn Mawr dissertation, 1936.

borrowing and lending of dramatic texts, not their independent use of a common liturgy, that accounts for their more significant likenesses.

The less controversial sections of the book add little to what has been written by others, but the pages devoted to possible Byzantine origins and connections, which take account of the recent studies of Cottas and La Piana, are useful and in general sane. Sensible too are the author's remarks about the beginnings of the Passion play (pages 164-165) which she rightly regards as an extension backward of the Easter office. If this volume had given us an objective survey of Italian contributions to the liturgical drama, some of which have only recently become available, its results might have been valuable. Instead, a misguided attempt to credit Rome alone with initiating the church plays has led to false emphasis and in many instances to a defective and misleading interpretation of the evidence.

GRACE FRANK

*Bryn Mawr College*

---

*Art d'Occident: le moyen âge roman et gothique.* Par HENRI FOCILLON. Paris, Librairie Armand Colin, 1938. Pp. vi + 361. Avec 86 figures dans le texte et 63 planches hors texte.

Returning in this book to the theme of an earlier work,<sup>1</sup> here developed in accordance with a broader method and embracing the latest researches of medieval scholarship, M. Focillon warns that he now has to do neither with an "introduction to art" nor with an archeological handbook, but rather with a history, *i.e.*, a study of relationships which were established between the actions, ideas and visible forms of medieval civilization in the west. His purpose is to provide a basis for research, to assemble and organize the mass of facts and theories which bear upon the life and art of the Middle Ages and thus to trace the course of western civilization from the eleventh century to the Renaissance. In this respect it seems to me his success is outstanding. Assisted by an able corps of co-workers and students he has covered a vast range of territory bristling with controversial matters, yet in each instance the present state of investigation has been well summarized, the evidence weighed and a reasonable conclusion suggested. On a great many questions judgment is naturally suspended, for the author, mindful of his main purpose, frequently contents himself with citation of his sources, leaving the reader to form his own opinion on the basis of the authorities listed.

The fundamental thesis of the book, developed with cumulative effect as the argument progresses, demonstrates the formation of a unique and original culture, in essence Gallic and authentically western, which arose from the amalgamation of diverse oriental, barbaric and late classic elements. Fused through a series of great creative experiments by the action of the French

1. *La Civilisation en Occident du XI<sup>e</sup> au milieu du XV<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Paris, 1933.

genius in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and brought to a magnificent climax in the thirteenth, this culture is vastly more than a monumental phase of art. It is a way of life, a mode of thought, a manner of building—as robust, forceful and typically occidental as were the youthful peoples of medieval France.

For a survey covering so broad a range of thought and art a chronological framework is essential. Book I therefore deals with the Romanesque period, the second book with the Gothic and the third with the end of the Middle Ages, the latter concluding in a chapter on the medieval aspects of the Italian Renaissance. Selection of matter for detailed comment from a work of the scope indicated imposes upon the reviewer a somewhat delicate task, the more so since in the present instance he cannot allow himself to be drawn into discussions of a technical nature. I shall therefore merely attempt to point out those aspects of the book which should appeal to Romance scholars interested in medieval Europe, and more particularly to those who are students of literary history and of the history of ideas.

The major rôle assigned to architecture in M. Focillon's pages needs no apology, since its primacy among the arts of the Middle Ages cannot be too strongly stressed. No other period of history produced monuments more numerous and of vaster scale, and no other architecture reflects more clearly the conditions of life and thought from which it grew. Although it absorbed by no means all the vital forces of medieval art it nevertheless defined them all and gave to each its aim and purpose, becoming with them the common tongue of western Christianity.

All are aware that the centuries which followed upon the period of barbarian invasion had seen the decline of building and the rise of the minor arts. But as to the subsequent revival of architecture scholars had until recently been disposed to accept too literally the famous phrase of Raoul Glaber on the safe passage of the year 1000 and the impetus which it gave to building. M. Focillon points out however that the importance of the millenium is entirely arbitrary if we would attach to it an absolute value as a point of reference, since the revival of western architecture really begins with the second half of the tenth century in the hands of a great line of monastic church builders and reformers of religious orders, and its flowering in the Romanesque style is by no means a sudden and miraculous awakening at the end of a barbarous age. Studied in the last quarter of the eleventh century and the first quarter of the twelfth this architecture reveals the two fundamental conditions of life which favored it, *i.e.*, the establishment on the one hand of stable urban communities, local and sedentary by nature, and on the other the rise of the great monastic institutions which, disregarding national lines, developed a vast system of intercommunication which influenced the whole of Europe. In this latter movement the political and spiritual rôle of Cluny was exceptionally important. Cluny had organized and fostered the pilgrimage idea and thus

became the mobile soul of the period, projecting itself in continuous waves of influence along the great pilgrimage routes. The part which Cluny played in the creation and spread of the *chansons de geste* is also believed by M. Focillon to have been considerable. In discussing the sculpture of this period the author brings out another interesting thought:

L'instinct et la science du jeu dialectique dans les figures [*i.e.*, in subjecting them to a strictly geometric system of composition] sont d'accord avec la dialectique dans la forme de la pensée. Il n'est pas indifférent de noter que, sur ce point, la scolastique du temps et la décoration des églises sont également dominées par la philosophie de l'abstraction, et que ces puristes d'une logique désintéressée combinent, les uns et les autres, d'élégants méandres formels. Mais, tandis que le dialecticien se perd dans le dédale de combinaisons vaines, l'imagier, collaborant avec l'architecte, crée un monde, prolonge l'homme au delà de ses limites, donne une forme et une figure à toutes les audaces de ses songes.

The layman, in recalling the two great stylistic phases of medieval art, is apt to assume that in point of time the one followed the other. But this, M. Focillon insists, involves a misconception. From Romanesque art to Gothic there is not, properly speaking, a chronological succession but instead the phenomenon of a secondary and somewhat retarded school, that of the Ile-de-France, developing into a dominant focus. Thus the Romanesque style of the Ile-de-France was in fact Gothic in an early form, destined to grow and expand with the power of the Capetian kings. Yet even before the middle of the twelfth century it had created its first masterpiece in the Abbey Church of Saint-Denis. Saint-Denis however is more than a masterpiece, it is the projection of a great personality. Suger, Abbé of Saint-Denis and minister of Louis VII, is no legendary figure but a real historical personage whose remarkable character is revealed to us in the book which he wrote about his church, the *Liber de consecratione ecclesiae*. As inspirer and director of the artists who created Saint-Denis he did more perhaps than any other man to establish the Gothic style. The rôle of the Cistercians in this respect was also extremely important; for what Cluny had done for Romanesque art in an earlier age Cîteaux did for Gothic throughout the whole of Europe.

Peculiarly interesting for the light which it throws on thirteenth century civilization is the author's study of the spread of the Gothic style. Some districts, he points out, remained strongly conservative and accepted the new style grudgingly, others seemed quite open to its influence, and still others, taking over certain of its principles or features, proceeded to develop them in so individual and creative a spirit that the resulting works can scarcely be recognized as Gothic. "La vie et l'expansion des formes plastiques," he declares, "n'ont peut-être jamais présenté de plus curieuses analogies avec la vie et l'expansion des formes linguistiques." As examples of local variants he cites among others the unique 'fortress Cathedral' of Albi and the Franciscan churches of Italy, and adds that, despite the interest of the latter, French architecture produced no masterpiece in Italy. The great cathedral of Gothic



Italy is the *Divine Comedy*, its jewelled windows the frescoes of Assisi—for Dante, like Giotto, stems from the same line as the cathedral builders and monumental sculptors of France.

Although the end of the Middle Ages was not marked by mass migrations as was their inception, it was at least signalized by the final waves of the same vast displacements of population. Thus the second half of the fifteenth century and the opening years of the sixteenth witnessed the decline or disappearance of the three great civilizations which had provided the framework for medieval Europe, the Byzantine, the Arabic and the Gothic. The historical phenomena which accompanied and which explain the decline of the latter were of various sorts and appear most unmistakably in France. Exhausted by the Hundred Years' War and weakened by the decimation of the old warlike and chivalrous order, the country saw the rise of a wealthy bourgeois class of luxurious but undiscriminating taste. At the same time the already weakened monarchy was menaced by the suddenly expanding power of Burgundy, and Paris, rivalled by the brilliant court at Dijon and the flourishing cities of Bruges and Ghent, remained no longer the sole focus of culture. Thus in place of the strong and unified spirit which had given tone to the faith of the great Gothic age there grew up a cult of polite affectation, of elaboration and over-refinement of taste which we see reflected in the eccentricities of the flamboyant style, in the 'intrigue romances' and in the costume and manners of the period. As M. Focillon so well observes, all great civilizations begin with the epic, culminate in religion and end with the romance. Yet the medieval spirit did not die. It lived to become the ferment of the Renaissance and, by virtue of its vital quality, saved the latter from assuming the character of a mere revival.

In concluding this discussion of a worthwhile book the reviewer cannot speak too highly of its format and general appearance. The letter-press, well organized and remarkably free from typographical errors, is clear and attractive; the line-drawings distributed throughout the text are well done, accurate and for the most part conveniently placed; while the numerous full-page plates are of uniformly high quality and often beautiful in themselves. Unfortunately however the illustrations, though numbered, are never referred to in the text, an omission which I found annoying since it frequently necessitated searching for a subject which might or might not appear. But this is a minor matter, particularly in view of the fact that M. Focillon has given us in *Art d'Occident* not merely a brilliant example of modern French scholarship, of the Gallic genius for organization and synthesis in a happy literary style; he has here produced a work which, because of its validity and charm, will have a wide appeal and may well become a classic in the modern literature of the Middle Ages.

EMERSON H. SWIFT

Department of Fine Arts  
Columbia University



*Flore et Blancheflor nach der Pariser Handschrift 375 (A) mit Glossar neu herausgegeben.* Von WILHELMINE WIRTZ. Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Moritz Diesterweg, 1937. Pp. 190.

Of all the tales current in the Middle Ages perhaps the most widely diffused was that of *Flore et Blancheflor*, versions of which exist in various European languages all the way from Greek to Icelandic. Two of these, composed toward the end of the Twelfth Century, are in French: the so-called *version populaire*, of which only one copy is known, and the *version aristocratique*, found in four MSS, three of them, designated by the sigla A, B and C, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and the fourth, a long fragment, discovered in 1916, in Rome. A somewhat faulty copy of A was published by Immanuel Bekker, Berlin, 1844, and a text based on A, B and C was published, together with the *version populaire*, by Edélestand Du Méril, Paris, 1856. These dates, as well as the discovery of an additional MS, are a sufficient indication of the need for a new edition; this need, however, will hardly be met by the edition here to be considered.

As the title indicates, the text presented is merely that of A, printed almost without emendation, but provided with diacritical marks, modern capitalization, and an attempt at punctuation not always successful in bringing out the sense—or lack of sense—of the text; see, for example, vss. 13, 15, 535-536, 1080-1084, 1113-1118, 1273, 1309, 2058-2067, 2419, 2583-2584. This text is followed by the variants from B and C, their existence being indicated by more than eight hundred reference figures; then follows a seemingly diplomatic copy of the Rome fragment (1606 verses), to which no references are given. Since A is frequently defective, the reader is constantly obliged to turn to the back of the book, hunting for better readings which he may write down on the margins and thus establish a more satisfactory text; he would have been spared this distracting waste of time and effort if the variants had been printed below the text, where they properly belong.

To this inconvenient arrangement are added doubts as to the accuracy and completeness of the materials provided. The text of A has been collated with the MS by M. Alfred Jeanroy, and the corrections of errors in transcription and interpretation noted by this scholar (none of them repeated here) will be found in *Romania*, LXIII (1937), 534. The variants not having been collated, it is impossible to say whether they are accurately transcribed; it is certain, however, that they are far from complete, since many of the readings given by Du Méril are omitted, including even some of those in B which he adopted. The critical apparatus is not always clear. Some of the variants given are not assigned to any MS; twice, instead of a variant, appears the mysterious expression *in A* (one supposes that to be true of the text as a whole); no clear indication is given of the fact that the long episode of the *encanteor* (793 ff.) is not in B; in a few cases, the readings of A are given, showing that they have been replaced in the text by those of B; twice, where such changes have

fortunately not been made, one finds erroneous directions to "read" otherwise than as in the text.

The transcription follows Bekker more often than Du Méril, especially in cases where the former's interpretation was at fault. No hint as to the method of resolving the abbreviations is given, but one more than suspects the spelling *moult*, for the *ml't* of the scribes, to have been suggested by the earlier editions rather than by anything in the MSS. Du Méril states (page ccxxvii) that *molt* occurs once (vs. 2377 in A) and that there is "perhaps" not a single example of *moult*; at any rate, the transcription offers no other example of this double spelling of *l* vocalized before a consonant. Other annoying inconsistencies are: *ai(n)snee* (MS: *aisnee*), as though the *n* were a mistake; *me sire* and (once *me[s]* *sire*; a *mont* and (rarely) *amont*, as in glossary; *or en droit* in the text, *orendroit* in the glossary. Much more serious errors are the following: *sel* 542, 2085 = *si le*, not *cel*; *Se (li dist)* 1701 = *Si*, not *Ce*, *si* often becoming *se* by dissimilation before *li* (cf. 2309, where *Se A = Si B*); *recourier* 983 (taken for the verb *recourir*!) should be *recovrier*, 'remède'; *Por* 1044 seems to be a misreading for *Par*, as in the other MSS and editions, and as required by the context; *repaïré* 1066 should be *repaïrie* (Picard form = *repaïree*); *c'or (remanés)* 1129, an absurdity in Bekker, should be *car*, as in B (and Du Méril); *Lors* 1309 should be *Fors* in order to make sense, and was so read by the earlier editors; *vivre* 1869 should be *wivre*; *s'emprés* 2124 should be *semprés*, 'aussitôt,' and *emprés* in the glossary omitted; *s'une* 2371 seems to be a misreading or a misprint for *l'une*, as in the other editions; *cascuns valt* 2997, given by both Bekker and Du Méril as the reading of A, is indicated (page 118) as an emendation for *cascun valt*; however this may be, *valt* would be perfectly correct, as it is merely another way of spelling *vaut* (= *veut*), a dialectal form which the scribe frequently uses (77, 101, 916, etc.), and which the editor seems never to have recognized; *s'en voient* 3158 should be *s'en-voisent*. Two verses are omitted and must be borrowed from the earlier editions: 1849, which reads: *Paradesus (Par quoi sus B) monte une fontaine*, and 2209 (replaced without rime or reason by 2188): *Et dist: "Ne sanlés (samblez D.M.) pas espie*.

"Das Glossar," says the editor, "ist mit Absicht ausführlich gestaltet, um auch Anfängern und Nichtromanisten entgegenzukommen." It is doubtless for the benefit of these "beginners" that all the common words identical in form and sense with those in Modern French are translated into German; but what are readers in need of such elementary assistance supposed to do with the many strangely spelled irregular or dialectal forms and the formulas and idiomatic expressions, scarcely any of which are given? The easily recognizable forms, such as infinitives, are listed, while even references to lines offering puzzling forms are rare or lacking; *menoit* 96, *soloit* 2729, *volés* 5 may be found by looking up *mener*, *soloir* and *voloir*, but not *maintenant* 104, *seut* 949, *sot* 2348 (both = pres. ind. 3 of *soloir*), *vaut* (*passim*) or *vausis*

1625. Even when references are given, how will a reader who needs to be told the meanings of *cri*, *crier*, *croire*, etc. know where to look for such forms as *sauroit* 914, *cremés* 1216, *oirre* 1625? References are frequently not given until after the word has occurred many times; for example, *es* (ecce) is not noted until its seventh occurrence. In some cases, no references are given, and the information conveyed is so vague and incomplete as to be wholly misleading, as when it is said that *el* = *en le*. Instead of one article there should be three: (1) *el* = *ele* 190, 311, 396, etc., = *eles* 2342; (2) *el* = *en le* 1699, 1821, 1883, etc.; (3) *el*, 'autre chose' 1458, 2128. Some words and locutions are omitted: *quan ke*, 'tout ce que' 1126; *ja soit çou ke*, 'quoique' 1599, 2996; *mais que*, 'pourvu que' 3015; *beter*, 'faire combattre' 3149. Some are mis-translated: *a tant* = 'alors,' 'là-dessus,' not 'als es so weit war'; *assés* = 'beau-coup,' 'très,' not 'genug,' and never has any such meaning as 'schon noch,' 'späterhin'; *nagier* = 'segeln,' but not 'schwimmen'; *sans calenge* 1029 = 'indubitablement'; *metre calenge* 2110 = 'mettre opposition'; *por nul essoine* 1336 = 'pour rien au monde'; *deffulé* 2871 = 'découvert,' 'sans chapeau,' not 'deshabillé'; *sains* 2953 = 'reliques'; *bort* 1381 is translated '(frischer) Wind,' following Du Ménil, who cites Scandinavian words similar in form and meaning; but until some other example of *bort* in this sense is found, it would seem better to regard this interpretation as doubtful (B omits the passage and the Rome fragment reads: *et al vent nort*). Lack of space forbids mention of many other inaccuracies and confusions in need of correction.

The *version populaire* must still be read in Du Ménil, and those who wish to read the *version aristocratique* for the sake of the story are likely to prefer that antiquated edition to one that gives so much trouble and provides so little real help.

HERBERT K. STONE

Columbia University

---

*Chroniques de Jean Molinet.* Publiées par GEORGES DOUTREPONT et OMER JODOGNE. Bruxelles, Palais des Académies, 1935-1937. Tome I: 1474-1488; Tome II: 1488-1506; Tome III: Introduction, glossaire, index. Pp. 654 + 606 + 447.

L'histoire littéraire a ses problèmes d'*Anschluss*, pacifiques d'ailleurs, ceux-ci, ne faisant couler que de l'encre. Ces conflits se distinguent de ceux de la politique guerrière en ce qu'ils servent la cause de l'intelligence et aussi en ce qu'ils sont toujours soulevés et exploités par de gentils voisins. Ainsi en est-il de l'annexion littéraire à la Belgique, par les Belges, d'écrivains de langue française comme Froissart, Commines, Jean Lemaire de Belges—et Jean Molinet. C'est en effet par ce dernier et ses *Chroniques*, éditées par MM. Georges Doutrepoint et Omer Jodogne, que l'Académie Royale de Belgique inaugure—dignement, royalement—sa *Collection des anciens auteurs belges*.

Au début (pages 1-9) du Tome III contenant l'Introduction, le Glossaire et l'Index, Georges Doutrepoint explique pourquoi on peut regarder comme belge ce Molinet qui naquit à Desvres en Boulonnais et mourut à Valenciennes en Hainaut, en dehors du terroir de la Belgique actuelle. C'est qu'il a, dit Georges Doutrepoint, une *âme bourguignonne* et toute dévouée aux anciens souverains de la Belgique. D'accord! mais ce critère de tendances et de sentiments politiques ne va plus très bien si on veut faire de Commynes un auteur belge. Au reste, ces chicanes n'importent guère et, dans le cas de Molinet, il faut se féliciter d'une annexion qui nous vaut la première vraie édition critique et la seule que nous ayons de ses *Chroniques*, celle plus que centenaire et moins que médiocre de J. A. Buchon ne comptant pas.

Il ne doit pas y avoir beaucoup moins de trente ans que Georges Doutrepoint a conçu l'entreprise de cette édition. Il y était déjà fortement engagé à Louvain en 1914 quand l'incendie de la bibliothèque par MM. les Allemands anéantit ses copies, ses notes, son labeur ainsi que cinq MSS des *Chroniques* prêtés par Bruxelles et Paris. Parmi ces MSS brûlés il en est un, le No. 10385 de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles, désigné par *D*, dont Georges Doutrepoint avait pu se convaincre avant le tragique brûlement de 1914 qu'il méritait de servir de base à son édition. Nous ne pouvons ici songer à résumer la description et la critique des vingt-sept MSS (Introduction, pages 102-156) qui aboutissent à justifier le choix fait comme base du MS 5438 de Bruxelles, en la carence de *D*, à jamais disparu. Pour l'établissement du texte<sup>1</sup> Georges Doutrepoint s'est adjoint un précieux collaborateur en la personne de M. Omer Jodogne, archiviste aux Archives générales du Royaume de Belgique, lequel a pris à charge l'enquête sur les MSS découverts après la guerre, la critique des copies et l'identification des personnages et des lieux. Cette solidarité scientifique à base d'abnégation a quelque chose de beau et d'exemplaire comme toute l'histoire de cette édition.

Les *Chroniques* dont l'élaboration, dit Georges Doutrepoint, a constitué le labeur capital de la vie d'écrivain de Jean Molinet ne sont pas cependant un ouvrage soigné à l'extrême ni "fini". Il faut dire d'ailleurs qu'elles ne nous sont parvenues que sous la forme de la copie d'un semi-archétype perdu lequel était un récolement par Augustin Molinet, fils de Jean, d'un texte paternel. C'est le récit, fait de pièces et de morceaux, d'événements qui vont dans le temps de 1474, date du siège de Neuss, à 1506, date de la mort de Philippe le Beau et se jouent dans le duché de Bourgogne, avec l'accent sur la Flandre,

1. Pour les variantes les éditeurs qui avaient commencé par en donner un plein appareil (ch. 1 du texte) y ont renoncé pour s'en tenir à signaler les leçons du MS 5618, anc. fonds français de B.N. Ils ont eu parfaitement raison, ce nous semble, sauf dans un cas: A la page 168 du Tome I de leur texte, on lit à propos du Téméraire tué à Nancy: Soudit corps . . . fut recongnu . . . a la playe d'une escarboucle qu'il avoit en la *poiville*" Cet impossible *poiville* n'est-il pas une mauvaise lecture pour *poitrine* et cette lecture n'est-elle rectifiée dans aucun MS? On aimerait le savoir. Le Glossaire—excellent—nous donne *poiville* avec un ? mais aurait du donner aussi *escarboucle* avec le sens assez rare qu'il a ici d'anthrax ou phlegmon.

la France et l'Autriche. Dans ces récits le spectaculaire (fêtes, banquets, entrées) tient beaucoup de place mais aussi le détail familial et local. Enfin l'auteur est bien de son temps par l'intérêt qu'il porte aux "merveilles". Il va sans dire aussi, comme il s'agit d'un Grand Rhétoriqueur, que les pédanteries et les baveries ne manquent guère ni les allitérations biscornues.<sup>2</sup>

Cependant notre homme, avec son tempérament à la fois si bourgeois et si pittoresque, ne laisse pas d'être assez attachant. En dépit de ses puérilités et crédulités il a un gros bon sens non sans vigueur et parfois non sans finesse. Il s'efforce d'être juste et véridique bien que le loyalisme bourguignon soit chez lui absolu. Il ne pense pas beaucoup par lui-même mais il saisit toute occasion de voir et d'entendre par lui-même, d'être témoin, d'interviewer, de fournir aussi quand il peut le document et la pièce. A ce sujet la déclaration suivante est caractéristique: "Aultrez tres cleres et haultes proesses de grande recommandation ont este acheviees en aultres quartiers a l'honneur de la maison de Bourgoigne, lesquelz je tenray en silence jusques ad ce que je me porray trouver es lieux ou les exploits en ont este fais, pour enquerir la verite" (f.154, col.b). On sent chez lui le conflit entre l'historiographe louangeur à gages et le relateur qui s'efforce vers l'impartialité. A ce propos rien n'est plus curieux que la façon dont il traite les grands personnages des deux clans adverses. Pas de portraits, pas de 'ramassés' puissants de caractères comme chez Commynes mais des réflexions où Molinet apprécie la renommée plus que la valeur des personnages (optique impersonnelle qui est presque étrangère à Commynes). Ainsi, à propos du Téméraire: "Riens ne dénigra tant la renommée du duc Charles que de adjouster credence a aucuns malvais esperitz . . . qui l'enortèrent et soufflerent en l'oreille de prendre sur les benefices, chapelles et cantuaires non amortis, les revenues de .III. années pour subvenir a ses affaires" (f. 100, col.d).<sup>3</sup>

En général, si on essayait à toute force de définir d'après les *Chroniques* et d'après l'excellente étude des éditeurs l'attitude de Molinet, il nous semble qu'on verrait ceci: Cet homme si fidèle à Bourgogne est aussi très fidèle à l'esprit médiéval: Il est "étranger à l'humanisme" (Dupire, *Jean Molinet*, pages 23 et 355); il est étranger à la pré-réforme; il est avant tout curieux de prouesse et du 'bruit' de prouesse; curieux aussi de 'merveille' il est étrangement fermé à ces nouveaux horizons de la Renaissance française que G. Atkin-

2. Exemples pris au hasard: "Et ainsy, demora l'Escluse en paix qui en lui fut incluse, car la guerre fut d'elle excluse, plus solitaire que rencluse" (f. 290, col. a); "se le patron eternal n'eust appaisé la ruïne, nous estions sans roy et sans roïne" (f. 454, col. d). Il nous semble que Molinet use surtout de ce procédé comme mot de la fin, en conclusion de chapitres et qu'il en abuse en vieillissant. En tout cas on ne saurait guère parler ici d'un jeu d'humour car on trouve souvent chez Molinet ces fantaisies verbales dans le récit des événements les plus solennels et graves. Il devait y avoir là dans sa pensée une sorte de moyen décoratif, une forme d'éloquence.

3. Molinet rappelle un peu plus loin que le seul service solennel célébré pour l'âme et le repos de Charles le fut à Gand. On observera aussi combien à défaut de piété incontestable (cf. Introduction, p. 50 et seq.) Molinet garde une attitude fortement cléricale.

son a décrits dans son beau livre récent et qui pourtant commençaient à poindre de son temps. Ainsi, dans des *Chroniques* s'étendant jusqu'en 1506, pas l'ombre d'une allusion à la découverte de l'Amérique. Il serait naïf de s'en étonner trop mais impossible de ne s'en étonner point.

Mentalité médiévale donc mais pour le style c'est une autre histoire. Et c'est un point par lequel Molinet, avec tous ses défauts et ses baveries, pousse vers la Renaissance des antennes artistes. Molinet a du style. On se prend à penser que pour la prose française il y a une chaîne sans trop de brisure d'Alain Chartier à Guez de Balzac et que Molinet, en ses bons moments, est un anneau de cette chaîne. Pour cela comme pour la valeur historique inégale mais réelle de ses *Chroniques* il méritait le tracassier héroïque, le labeur et la science que représente cette magnifique édition—cependant que M. Dupire poursuit, dans la collection des *Anciens textes français*, la publication des œuvres poétiques du chanoine de Valenciennes.

LOUIS CONS

Harvard University

---

*Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega.* A Revised Edition. By J. P. WICKER-SHAM CRAWFORD. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1937. Pp. 211.

Students of the early Spanish drama will greet with pleasure this revised edition of Professor Crawford's well-known handbook. It now appears with an alphabetically arranged bibliography and an index of plays which will greatly increase its usefulness. The text has not been materially changed, but has been carefully brought up to date, and this involved not a few modifications and additions, for the field has been diligently cultivated since 1922.

We are presented here, then, with a dependable body of facts, intelligently arranged, soberly presented and made easily accessible. This is no small accomplishment, even in these days of impatient attempts at synthesis and interpretation, and only those who have worked in unmapped or badly-surveyed territory will fail to realize its value.

On this basis further research can safely progress toward a future recreation of the sixteenth-century drama and stage in terms of sixteenth-century civilization.

JOSEPH E. GILLET

Bryn Mawr College

---

*Etat présent des études sur Descartes.* Par JEAN BOORSCH. Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1937. Pp. x + 196.

This is a particularly welcome addition to the series of the *Etudes Françaises* which already contains a number of valuable and authoritative works



of varying size on the present state of studies on Villon, Rabelais, Montaigne, Diderot, Lamartine, Stendhal and others.

Since the monumental Adam-Tannery edition of Descartes, completed in 1912, started appearing in 1896, the year in which the tercentenary of the philosopher's birth was celebrated, the whole subject of Descartes has been given new life and significance by a series of notable studies on his relation to scholasticism (Gilson), his scientific work (Gaston Milhaud), his life in Holland (Cohen), his religious thought (Gouhier), his ethics (Mesnard) and so forth. New letters and minor writings have been published (Roth, Thibaudet-Nordstrom); and many smaller contributions have been made on one or another point of the life, work and influence of France's greatest philosopher, who stands at the entrance to her greatest age of literature.

A survey, therefore, of the present state of Descartes studies was particularly needed; and Professor Boorsch's work, appearing as it does at a time when a new incentive to Descartes study has been given by the tercentenary of the publication of the *Discours de la méthode*, with its further crop of contributions of varying merit and importance, is a most valuable guide. M. Boorsch takes account of the special centenary issues of the *Revue de Synthèse* and the *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*<sup>1</sup> and of the three Cahiers devoted to Descartes in the proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Philosophy, held in Paris in July 1937 under the sign of Descartes himself. None who were present will forget the impression of unity conferred upon the varied proceedings and deliberations by constant reference to the "father of modern philosophy."

But M. Boorsch has not limited himself to surveying the work of others. He has himself followed Descartes' development in the light of what is known of it today, and he has done so with remarkable judgment and command of the subject; so that his book serves not only as a guide to the scholar and philosopher already relatively familiar with what he is writing about, but also as a useful introduction to the study of Descartes for all. In this respect the book goes beyond the promise of its title.

Following as he does "le développement de la pensée de Descartes telle que la présentent dans leur ordre chronologique les témoignages qui en subsistent" (page ix), the author gives great importance, for instance, to the *Monde* (completed already by 1633 but not published until 1664), and so he has to dwell somewhat less on the better known works, though the *Discours* in particular is very fully analysed. "Si ce genre d'exposé [he adds] perd en systématisation, il gagne en fidélité à l'histoire des idées cartésiennes, et pour ainsi dire en vérité organique, ce qui est notre objet principal." I am not quite sure about the expression "vérité organique," but M. Boorsch certainly succeeds in respecting scrupulously the historical facts and in giving at the

1. To which should be added special numbers of the *Revue de Littérature Comparée* and of the *Revue Philosophique*, which appeared too late for mention in M. Boorsch's book.



same time a sense of coherent development. As he proceeds he tells us what new problems have been raised in connection with different aspects of Descartes' work, and not only gives us the gist of the controversy but his own conclusions, to which the thoroughness of his survey lends authority. There is, for instance, an excellent summing up of the place and significance given by the many scholars who have recently dealt with the matter, to the dreams of Descartes, their interpretation and the nature of the "mirabilis scientia" (pages 15-23); and further on he shows with admirable clarity and economy of words what a wealth of light has been shed upon the theological aspects of Descartes' thought in recent years (pages 144-145). In consequence of the method adopted we get a balanced view of Descartes' thought as a whole and of his aims, due prominence being given on the one hand to his physics and on the other to his metaphysics, and due importance both to his desire to "appuyer la foi par la raison humaine" and to his aim of making man master of extension.

Descartes, though a philosopher and not at the same time (like Plato) a great literary artist, must none the less concern those who study French literature. By writing and publishing his *Discours* in French "qui est la langue de mon pays, plutôt qu'en latin, qui est celle de mes précepteurs," and by writing it so as to be comprehended of all, "even women," he extended the field of French literature to include philosophy, as Calvin, one hundred years before, had extended it to include theology. This work, with its attractive intellectual biography, its rules of method, its provisional ethic, its "Je pense, donc je suis," its ontological proof, has become an integral part of the educated Frenchman's heritage—"une des lectures les plus attachantes, mais aussi les plus ardues de notre littérature classique," as M. Boorsch puts it (page 111). The *Meditations* had more importance in their day—and so had the *Principia*; but Descartes wrote them in Latin,—and if they belong to the classics of philosophy, as they undoubtedly do, they do not so immediately belong to French literature, though the translations, made respectively by the Duc de Luynes and the Abbé Picot and revised by Descartes, are not to be despised. We should, moreover, make an exception in the case of the notable French epistolary preface written by the philosopher himself for the translation of the *Principia*, and which contains the famous passage comparing philosophy to a tree. The late Gustave Lanson long ago pointed out a certain parallelism between the *Traité des passions*, also originally written in French, and the psychology which Corneille's plays seem to suppose. But the Treatise despite its subject-matter has not got the general interest and appeal of the *Discours*; and as for the letters, though most of those in French as well as in Latin were already published by Clerselier (3 volumes, 1657, 1659 and 1666), those of the French ones which have a general appeal have only in recent times been separated from the others. The letters addressed to the Princess Elizabeth in particular offer an attractive view of the Cartesian interpretation of Stoicism;

and some of them deserve to be classed among the best of their kind in an age which was great in this as well as in other fields.<sup>2</sup>

It is refreshing to reflect that it is under feminine influence (Elizabeth—and to a much lesser extent Christina) that Descartes was induced to tackle the thorniest problems of psychology and ethics, problems which are the constant preoccupation of the "moraliste," but which the prudent if greatly ambitious creator of the *méthode* was disposed because of their very complexity to put off treating, since the "most perfect ethic" which was ultimately to emerge and which was to represent "le dernier degré de la sagesse," must presuppose "une entière connaissance des autres sciences." But the niece of Charles I plied him with urgent and penetrating questions, which demanded serious answers. Do we not here find—but on an almost transcendental plane—yet another instance of that feminine influence which, working through the salons and in other ways, was to contribute so much to humanise the age?

The correspondence of Descartes and Guez de Balzac also deserves the attention of the student of literature; as does the philosopher's interesting if fragmentary essay in the art of dialogue, *La Recherche de la vérité*, to which M. Boorsch has unfortunately not the space to devote more than a footnote (page 165).

Indeed, though M. Boorsch rightly keeps in view the study of the philosopher's works as a whole, we should have welcomed in a work appearing in this series a somewhat greater emphasis on the aspect of the life and works which we have just indicated. But since this study gives the scholar such ample help towards following up his interests, it would be ungracious to insist upon what is not in itself a blemish in view of what M. Boorsch set out to do.

Descartes is important for the student of French literature in another way. He has left his mark on the French spirit; and the historian of literature has to reckon with this circumstance at every turn. His "influence" however is often so diffused, and comes together with so many other factors, that affirmations made regarding that "influence" are often foolhardy. Indeed, it has often simply to be recognised—without more precise claims regarding direct action and influence being advanced—that he represents more strikingly than any other single figure a certain tendency or predisposition of the French spirit. Names like Cousin remind us, however, that there is much more in it than this; and in our own day an Alain and a Paul Valéry bear unimpeachable witness to Cartesian inspiration.

M. Boorsch has some excellent concluding pages on the tasks which still await the scholar, and more particularly those which have to be carried out before a clearer answer can be given to the question: "dans quelle mesure l'esprit cartésien a-t-il infléchi l'esprit français?" Since Bouillier's *Histoire*

2. Attention deserves to be drawn to the recent editions of the *Traité des passions* and of the *Lettres sur la morale* (a title chosen by the editor), edited respectively by P. Mesnard and J. Chevalier, and both published by Boivin (1935 and 1937).

de la philosophie cartésienne and Lanson's valuable but brief survey, limited of course to writers belonging to "French literature,"<sup>3</sup> there is no general view of the Cartesian influence on French literature or thought available. M. Hazard's *La Crise de la conscience européenne* (1935) contains much that is valuable; and M. Mornet has some interesting general remarks in his *Histoire de la clarté française* (1929) to which M. Boorsch might also have referred. But the rôle of Cartesianism in the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns requires to be taken up again directly, and the action of Descartes in individual cases in the seventeenth century and since requires to be clearly assessed in the light of the materials available to contemporary scholarship.<sup>4</sup> It is abundantly clear by now at all events that the easy generalisations regarding "Descartes et l'esprit classique" are no longer admissible.

I have paid more particular attention to the aspects of this work which appear to me to have the most immediate interest for the student of French literature and culture. But its value, as offering a convincing general view of all Descartes' work, seen in the light of the most recent scholarship, should be recalled and stressed in conclusion.<sup>5</sup>

WILLIAM MCC. STEWART

University of St. Andrews, Scotland

---

*The Dramatic Works of Luis Vélez de Guevara, Their Plots, Sources, and Bibliography.* By FORREST EUGENE SPENCER and RUDOLPH SCHEVILL. Berkeley, University of California Publications in Modern Philology, 1937. Pp. xxvi + 388.

In June, 1919, the University of California conferred upon Forrest Eugene Spencer the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. In partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Dr. Spencer had submitted a dissertation bearing the title: *Luis Vélez de Guevara, A Study in His Life and Dramatic Art*. The work, not ready for publication at the time, was the object of the continued atten-

3. "L'Influence de la philosophie cartésienne sur la littérature française," *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 1896, reprinted in Lanson's *Etudes d'histoire littéraire*. Section IX (i.e., pp. 193-196, devoted to "L'Influence cartésienne") of M. Boorsch's excellent bibliography is particularly useful.

4. Cf. also p. 79 of Léon Brunschvicg's little book on *Descartes*, Rieder, 1937, which appeared too late to be included in M. Boorsch's survey, but which, with the valuable *Essais sur Descartes* of Henri Gouhier, Vrin, 1937, should be added to the works to which M. Boorsch draws attention.

5. A few minor slips should be noted (they do not detract from the scholarly character of this study): M. Boorsch has on three occasions (on pp. 58 and 185) fallen into the error of the French postal authorities, whose first issue of the commemorative stamps of 1937 described the work to be celebrated as "Discours sur la méthode." The history of the Collège de la Flèche is not by La Rochemonteix, but by le P. Camille de Rochemonteix (pp. 4 and 187). Péguy's work is designated *Note conjointe* (not "Notes conjointes") *sur M. Descartes* . . . (p. 191). The third, further revised edition of 1868 of Bouillier's two volumes should have been cited, not the second edition of 1854 (pp. 180 and 193).

tion of its author until an untimely death in February, 1920, cut short a career of brilliant promise. In the preparation of his dissertation Dr. Spencer had as guide and director Professor Rudolph Schevill, who, after Dr. Spencer's death, generously assumed the task of preparing the author's manuscript for publication. That the task thus assumed proved to be far greater than was anticipated is indicated by Professor Schevill himself who confesses, "It has turned out to be a more difficult undertaking than any of my own choosing has ever been" (Preface, page xii). Instead of a mere task of revision and arrangement of material Professor Schevill's became one of active collaboration, of bringing the work up to the present by incorporating "much additional material in the field of sources and bibliography. . . ." The excellent result of the collaboration can scarcely be appreciated except by those who have occasion to examine the work with close care and in detail.

Despite the fact that the personality and the work of Luis Vélez de Guevara have attracted and continue to attract the interest and attention of scholars and critics,<sup>1</sup> no comprehensive study of his life and works yet exists. Various investigators have brought to light in recent years many reliable data and in 1916-1917 Don Emilio Cotarelo y Mori, in his "Luis Vélez de Guevara y sus obras dramáticas" in *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, III, IV, brought these together, adding a few due to his own discoveries. But Sr. Cotarelo's article was not chiefly concerned either with the life or with an evaluation of the total literary work of Vélez, nor, as is shown by the title, is the work of Messrs. Spencer and Schevill so concerned; the primary object of Cotarelo's work was a complete bibliography of Vélez' dramatic output, with scant and at times very superficial examination of its nature; likewise the work of Messrs. Spencer and Schevill is concerned only with the dramatic production of Luis Vélez de Guevara, giving to the student however, in addition to an analysis of each dramatic work listed, an appreciation of its particular merit and a detailed investigation of its sources where such have been indicated. Thus the present work departs widely from its predecessor and in many respects entirely supplants it.<sup>2</sup> Let us examine it in some detail.

The Preface (pages xi-xiv) explains briefly the plan of the work and is followed by a short biographical sketch of Luis Vélez de Guevara (pages xv-xxiv), which is followed in turn by a Bibliography (pages xxv-xxvi) of the chief sources for the life and dramatic works of the author. The Bibliography, while not professing to list every title of interest for the author, omits nothing of essential importance, though perhaps L. Hohmann's *Studien zu Luis Vélez*

1. Among them the erudite Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín, an enthusiastic admirer and student of Vélez, who placed his vast fund of information and his materials at the disposal of Dr. Spencer during the course of the latter's preparation of the dissertation.

2. Aside from a somewhat ampler discussion (some sixty-seven pages) of the life of Vélez, with reference to documents, etc., Sr. Cotarelo's work will still be found of value to students of particular plays for its listing (occasionally incomplete) of *suelta* editions. Messrs. Spencer and Schevill make no attempt to record all *suelta* editions, though such a record is a desideratum.

*de Guevara* (Hamburg, 1899) deserves passing mention. The remainder of the volume is devoted to a detailed study of ninety-four dramatic compositions, all of which (except eight in which Vélez merely collaborated) are either indisputably by Vélez or are with good reason supposed to be his. The ninety-four compositions are grouped in seven categories: I. Comedias novelescas. II. Comedias histórico-novelescas. III. Comedias divinas (de Santos, Biblias, etc.). IV. Autos. V. Comedias escritas en colaboración. . . . VI. Entremeses y Bailes. VII. Comedias dudosas. For each work studied a uniform procedure has been employed. The title of the composition is followed by the opening and closing lines. Next comes mention of the first printed edition or the manuscript, if the play is unpublished, with indication of a library in which it can be found. These data are then followed by the list of characters immediately preceding the résumé or synopsis of the play. Then comes a brief appreciation of the play's merits, with additional bibliographical notes, a discussion of sources when such can be determined, and notes on the handling of the play's theme elsewhere in Spanish dramatic literature.

Professor Schevill's long-standing and unchallenged competence in the field of Spanish seventeenth-century drama is an immediate guarantee of complete and well-nigh definitive treatment, so far as the present status of Hispanic studies permits, of any item therein to which he devotes his attention. So for his handling of the dramatic work of Luis Vélez—within the limits set by the authors little of consequence has been left unnoticed or unsaid. On the contrary, in many instances there is a wealth of supplementary comment in the discussion of sources and other dramatic treatments of the theme under consideration such as one would hardly expect outside of a monograph on the composition in question. Witness the tracing of the legend of St. Catherine of Alexandria ([67] *La Rosa Alejandrina*) through Spanish literature, with some twenty bibliographical references; or the discussion of the legend of Sister Beatrice ([70] *Auto sacramental de la Abadesa del Cielo*) from its earliest appearance in the *Cantigas* of Alfonso the Learned down to Carlos Fernández Shaw's *Margarita la Tornera* (1908). Indeed, so valuable and so comprehensive is comment of the sort that, since the paths of Vélez and his fellow dramatists of the seventeenth century so frequently crossed, the work of Messrs. Spencer and Schevill becomes an invaluable aid to every student of the drama of the period.

According to his own claim and to a statement made by his son Juan and repeated by Montalván and Pellicer, Luis Vélez wrote more than four hundred comedias. The number need not be deemed exaggerated even though not one fourth of that number can be identified as his with complete certainty. Cotarelo admitted, in some cases with the greatest uncertainty, Vélez' claim to seventy-eight comedias wholly his, eight in collaboration, five doubtful, four autos sacramentales, five entremeses, and two bailes. The corresponding numbers accepted by Messrs. Spencer and Schevill are: seventy-seven, eight, seven, three, five, and two. Our authors reject or omit eleven titles listed by Cotarelo, add two

unknown to him. Of the titles omitted, one is a variant title, three are ascribed also to Juan Vélez, and of the remaining seven little or nothing is known.

To the well known difficulties that embarrass any attempt to compile a complete and accurate bibliography of almost any important seventeenth-century Spanish dramatist there are added in the case of Luis Vélez de Guevara further complication and confusion by the fact that his son Juan was also a dramatist of considerable reputation and early bibliographers ascribed indiscriminately plays now to the father, now to the son. Though there is no evidence to show that Juan Vélez was a prolific writer of *comedias*, yet in the *Indice* of Medel del Castillo fifty-two titles are assigned to him as against thirty *comedias* credited to his celebrated father. But of the fifty-two credited to the son, at least thirty-one are almost indisputably the father's and five or more are doubtfully to be ascribed to Juan Vélez. As an example of such confusion of attribution the case of *Zelos hazen estrellas y el amor haze prodigios* may be noted. Under the title *Zelos hazen estrellas* Medel del Castillo (*Indice*, page 122) lists it as "de D. Juan Velez," but under the title of *Amor haze prodigios* (*ibid.*, page 9) he lists it as "de Velez," meaning thereby the more famous father. La Barrera (*Catálogo*, page 467) lists a *suelta* in the name of Luis Vélez de Guevara, but Cotarelo (page 428) says it is "... del hijo de Luis, don Juan Vélez de Guevara." The truth of the case seems to be that the play was actually published separately under each name. Salvá (*Catálogo*, I, 663) asserts that the copy in his library bears the name of Juan Vélez, but adds, "pero yo la he tenido tambien á nombre del Luis y probablemente será de él." We do not know the present location of any copy of the edition ascribed to Juan Vélez; that issued under the name of Luis Vélez appears extremely rare, the only copies of which that have come to our notice being in the library of the University of Valencia and in the Schaeffer collection (cf. *Katalog*, page 24) now in Freiburg.

Seemingly less confusing, however, is the case of *El mejor Rey en rehenes*, a play not accessible to Cotarelo and not discussed by Messrs. Spencer and Schevill. In his *Indice* (page 71) Medel del Castillo records the play as "de D. Juan Velez," but apparently he was the only one to do so. La Barrera (page 467) lists a *suelta* edition among the works of Luis Vélez and in fact a copy of such an edition is to be found in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal in Paris. We do not know whether the copy is unique, but in any case it is extremely rare, and apparently there is no notice, except that of Medel's mentioned above, of an edition under the name of Juan Vélez. In passing, let us record here that a careful reading of the play left us with the distinct impression that it exhibits many of the striking and peculiar characteristics of Luis Vélez' dramatic style and devices, and for our part we should not hesitate to declare it a product of his pen.<sup>3</sup>

3. In view of the great rarity of the play a brief notice of it may prove acceptable. It is one of five *comedias* (the others being *El Marques del Basto*, *El cerco de Roma por el*



Concerning the bibliography of individual titles the authors leave little to be said. Occasional mention is made of the existence of a given title in the Ticknor collection. In point of fact, of the titles listed by Messrs. Spencer and Schevill thirty-three may be found in the Ticknor collection in one edition or another. Future readers at the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid may wish to examine there the rare *suelta* edition of No. 47, *La mayor desgracia de Carlos V . . .*, which bears the shelf-number T-19,004 (perhaps Durán's copy which Cotarelo could not find). The Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal at Paris has a number of the early editions and some *sueeltas*, but one volume listed in the library's catalogue as of Valladolid, 1607 (undoubtedly erroneous) and which, to judge from the contents as listed in the catalogue, was the *Tercera parte de las comedias de Lope de Vega y otros autores*, has disappeared. In the same library, ascribed to Vélez in the catalogue, is the *entremés*, *El hambriento*, Madrid, 1659, which apparently has escaped the attention of bibliographers.<sup>4</sup> Future investigators will likely wish to examine also the twenty-four titles in the library of the University of Valencia (among them No. 44, *De Ivliano Apóstata*, the copy of which in the British Museum is characterized by Messrs. Spencer and Schevill as "unique," though there are two copies in the Biblioteca Nacional—R-23,085, Durán's copy, in excellent condition, and R-23,086, a

---

*Rey Desiderio*, *Diego Garcia de Paredes*, and *Reynar después de morir*) in a volume catalogued as *Quinque comedias famosas* and bearing the shelf number 12,286. The copy is the usual quarto, without place or date, of sixteen leaves, with signatures A, A<sub>2</sub>, B, B<sub>2</sub>, C, C<sub>2</sub>, D, D<sub>2</sub>. The title reads: *El Mejor rey en rehenes./Comedia/Famosa./De Luis Velez de Guevara./Following the title: Hablan en ella las personas siguientes./*

San Luis de Francia	Christo	Abindarraez Moro
Don Carlos su hermano	Don Alexio Principe de	Xarifa Reyna mora
Don Alonso su hermano	Constantinopla	Doña Flor dama
El Pontifice Inocencio	Tudel su lacayo	Tisbe su criada
Su Delegado Oton	Soldan Rey Moro	Andronio caullero

[First lines]:

AND. Bolued a darme los pies,  
Principe y señor mio, de nueuo,  
pues ya en Leon de Francia  
libre y con salud os veo.

[Last lines]:

r. Y aqui el Poeta humilde, O gran Senado,  
pide perdon de lo q̃ huuiere errado.

The plot is concerned with a crusade led by Saint Louis of France, his rout at the Nile by floods, and his leaving Christ, symbolized in the Eucharist, as ransom for his person. On the occasion of the visit of the Pope to France, Flora is injured by a falling stand and is rescued by Alexio, who immediately falls in love with her. Alexio goes off on the crusade and is followed by Flora disguised as a soldier. Both fall captives of Soldan, but are rescued in the end when Louis sends eight thousand pounds in gold as payment of his ransom. Xarifa falls in love with Alexio and arouses Soldan's jealousy, thus providing a sort of secondary plot.

4. The writer did not have an opportunity to examine the copy. La Barrera (p. 626) lists three *entremeses* with this title, one by Moreto (1675), one by Villaviciosa (1663), the third anonymous (published in the *Theatro Español* of García de la Huerta, 1785).



copy mended in many places) for possible variants in text.<sup>5</sup> It is perhaps desirable to mention in connection with No. 64, *La hermosura de Raquel, Segunda parte*, the manuscript in the Biblioteca Municipal of Madrid with the title *El mas amante Pastor y dichoso Patriarca Joseph, Salvador de Egipto*. The second part of *La hermosura de Raquel* may have been published under the titles *El mas amante Pastor* and *Joseph, Salvador de Egipto*, as both are listed by Medel, but without name of author. No. 8, *El Conde don Pero Velez . . .*, has been the object of a critical edition by Dr. R. H. Olmsted (University of Minnesota doctoral dissertation, 1934, unpublished, but accepted for publication as Volume x of *Teatro Antiguo Español*) and No. 53, *El Príncipe Escanderbey*, has received similar attention on the part of Dr. B. B. Ashcom (University of Michigan, 1938, also unpublished). For No. 18, *El Niño diablo*, Dr. Florence Whyte has prepared a critical, annotated edition.

As a result of the critical estimates or judgments of individual plays expressed by our authors we may justly feel that a distinct advance has been recorded toward arriving at a true appreciation of Vélez' place in the history of the Spanish theatre. Earlier critics have been disposed to dismiss him as a servile imitator of Lope de Vega. Certain it is that Vélez was indebted to Lope on numerous occasions—who among his contemporaries escaped Lope's all-pervading influence?—but it now appears clear that Vélez' indebtedness was far less than has generally been supposed. On reading the essay of Cotarelo one is frequently left with the distinct impression that his work is more a championship of Lope than an impartial estimate of Luis Vélez. Nothing of the sort is felt in the work of Messrs. Spencer and Schevill, for here we have an admirably detached and unbiased appreciation of Vélez' dramatic production, and from such an appreciation Vélez gains distinctly without any impairment of fame for his more illustrious contemporary and fellow-dramatist.

Of a work so excellent in every way it would seem ungrateful to make any criticism whatever and in fact we offer none. But for ourselves, and doubtless for many future users of this invaluable contribution to Spanish dramatic history and bibliography, we can scarcely withhold a gentle expression of regret at the absence of a comprehensive index of authors and works cited and of dramatic themes discussed. We readily realize the enormous amount of fatiguing labor involved in such a compilation, but in a work so rich in content such an index becomes all the more desirable and would, we confidently believe, enhance materially the volume's value to the general student of the Spanish drama of the seventeenth century.

JOHN M. HILL

Indiana University

5. In the library's catalogue two titles, *Santa Isabel, Reyna de Portugal* and *El sitio y toma de Dobay*, are assigned to Vélez—through a cataloguer's error, we suspect. With the first of these titles there are plays by Rojas Zorrilla, Villafior, and, according to Medel, Matos Frago; the second is a title of a play by Francisco de Flores. As we have not had an opportunity to examine the Valencia copies we can venture no opinion on the value of the ascriptions other than that they are very probably erroneous.

*L'Europe française au siècle des lumières.* Par LOUIS RÉAU. Paris, Albin Michel, 1938. Pp. xvii + 455 + 2 cartes et 32 planches hors texte.

Ferdinand Brunot, linguiste éminent à tendances "avancées", avait admis qu'un grand fait de civilisation devait être expliqué en termes de civilisation. Au cours des années où se préparaient les tomes v, viii et ix de son *Histoire de la langue française*, rien n'était plus encourageant que de voir revenir, avec la nette mention "vu", les éléments qu'on lui fournissait pour une décisive enquête, et la page xi du tome viii témoigne d'une sorte de "conversion" qui avait dû coûter moins à sa parfaite loyauté de savant qu'à ses affinités "libertaires". M. Louis Réau, historien éminent de l'art, ne semble pas s'être décidé à un examen de conscience du même ordre. Admirablement au courant de l'art français dans le monde du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, il a surtout ajouté, pour des questions importantes, une information un peu "latitudinaire" à des connaissances plus spéciales qu'on est heureux de proclamer ici. D'où les mérites et les défauts d'un livre dont on aurait volontiers vu "guillemetter" le titre, puisque, dangereux par la prétention qu'il semble annoncer, il n'est couvert que par l'auteur italien d'une brochure de 1777, et, à un moindre degré, par le directeur d'une collection qui ne compte plus les synthèses intéressantes.<sup>1</sup>

*Les mérites*: ils sont, on ne saurait trop le redire, dans la reprise, par l'auteur si informé de l'*Histoire de l'expansion de l'art français*, des multiples témoignages d'estime que le siècle par excellence des amateurs d'art a prodigués, hors de France, aux peintres, sculpteurs, dessinateurs de jardins, architectes, graveurs, musiciens, etc., qui donnaient, de fait, à l'Europe sa figure essentielle. L'auteur nous offre même plus qu'il n'était tenu de fournir, puisque des pages entières sont consacrées ça et là (pages 144, 173, 384-385) à l'influence de l'art français dans les deux Amériques. C'est une vraie aubaine pour l'historien littéraire, l'historien des idées ou l'historien tout court, que de posséder une présentation condensée et illustrée du rayonnement des arts majeurs et mineurs, de forme et d'inspiration française, dans la plus grande partie de l'Europe—les pays musulmans ayant seuls à rester en marge d'une action acceptés peu ou prou par catholiques et protestants, aristocrates et monarques, arbitres des élégances et grands bourgeois, dilettantes et gens du monde. L'opposition, présentée ici, entre jardins à la française et à l'anglaise témoigne d'autant de goût que d'information (pages 354-357).<sup>2</sup>

1. Comme en ces matières il peut être utile de prendre rang, l'auteur du présent compte-rendu se permet de rappeler que "L'Europe française et l'appauvrissement de l'humanisme" est le titre du dernier chapitre du tome ii d'une *Littérature universelle* en voie d'élaboration à la Librairie Larousse. Cf. l'exposé de son plan général dans les *Annales de l'Université de Paris*, nov.-déc. 1934.

2. Le n° 1 de la Bibliographie pourrait compléter Betz par les relevés méthodiques d'"influences françaises" dans la *Revue de Littérature Comparée* (depuis 1921). Ajouter, entre autres, pour la Suède, Wrangel; Steinhausen pour l'Allemagne; Bartholmess pour l'Académie de Berlin; "et un air de politesse" à la citation du *Mercure galant*, p. 17. Ecrire Audra, V. du Bled, pp. 421-422; Fokisani, p. 13; Van Zuylen, p. 86; le 6 juillet, p. 88. Dès 1763, le *Messie* de Klopstock était révélé à l'Angleterre par Collyer (p. 45). Le *scalpsit*

*Les défauts*: un approfondissement insuffisant des causes organiques d'une indéniable prééminence; une sorte de décor planté sur un théâtre plutôt vide, et la période d'après 1750 bien plus fréquemment invoquée que l'âge antérieur qui la préparait; d'excellentes références, mais demandées, on l'a dit plus haut, à des ouvrages qui malgré tout s'inquiétaient en général de problèmes spéciaux et point de la question nettement centrale: celle des moyens d'action, des impulsions réelles, des correspondances favorables qui amenèrent vers le milieu du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle les apparences européennes à une manière d'identité, suivie à bref délai de rébellions que n'apaisa qu'en surface le succès des entreprises révolutionnaires et napoléoniennes. Ne taquinons pas l'auteur sur ses contradictions en fait de nationalités (puisque sa réponse, comme celle de ses personnages, serait *Sono di Cosmopoli*): le pauvre Schwindenhammer (page 336) tancé comme Allemand alors que ce fils d'un tabellion de Ferrette a encore des homonymes dans notre Est; Mme de Staël difficilement absoute d'être la petite-fille d'un Prussien, alors que Rivarol, fils d'Italien, passe aisément condamnation; Villers, "Janus bifrons," stigmatisé comme traître, etc. L'attitude de Leibniz et celle de Grimm sont en somme jugées selon des critères différents, ce qui laisse supposer une moindre complicité d'imagination que n'en exigerait le franc jeu des "dénationalisations" courantes. Ce qui ne veut pas dire que tout jugement devrait être suspendu: Voltaire se moque de nous, par exemple, dans sa lettre à Richelieu de juillet 1756, quand il reconnaît les "procédés de corsaires" de l'ennemi, mais refuse de prendre parti en raison de la fraternité de tous les philosophes. Ne nous inquiétons pas d'une répartition contestable des littératures (l'Angleterre, page 83, rangée parmi les "littératures germaniques") qui doit faire se retourner dans sa tombe J. J. Jusserand, historien et diplomate également vigilant. Et surtout ne faisons pas trop grief à l'auteur de ses listes de "mots-témoins" qui sont, au choix, *trop peu* ou *trop*: trop peu s'il s'agit de faire un recensement authentique, trop s'il faut tirer des conclusions de termes techniques en particulier, multipliés, sans conséquences sérieuses à en tirer, par les emprunts matériels. Ce n'est pas la quasi-universalité du "chauffeur" qui nous fera proclamer que des voitures uniquement françaises sillonnent les autostrades du monde; de même, si le *Punch* du 14 septembre dernier met dans deux bouches britanniques, sous deux vignettes voisines, "bon voyage" et "objet d'art," nous n'en concluerons pas que la France, à cette date, "menait" sa voisine. Les emprunts de vocabulaire entraînent un minimum de conséquences—si révélateurs soient-ils en bien des cas. Antoine Meillet nous fait admettre que le phénomène de l'emprunt est un procédé linguistique normal et courant dans toutes les langues au contact d'autres langues: bien des détails d'ordre militaire, sous M. de Saint-Germain, passaient de Prusse en France quand le vocabulaire allemand était lui-même surchargé de vocables venus de France et d'Italie. Si le sort fait, en revanche, aux mots de

de la page 14 a dû bien amuser le correcteur d'épreuves. La vraie grandeur de Byron et de Shelley (p. 375) ne coïncide pas avec l'Empire français.

"mode," "honnête homme," "belle assemblée," "agréments" et "belles-lettres," avait été mis en valeur et distingué des petites contingences de la cuisine et de l'atelier, on aurait mieux vu se dégager les origines et les linéaments propres du problème, au lieu de les voir confondus avec leurs effets et leurs vagues conséquences.

Il s'agissait en effet d'une technique particulière: celle de la vie en société, d'un certain ordre proposé aux Occidentaux, d'une façon parfaitement consciente de se comporter entre mortels, puis de l'extension de tous ces prestiges à de nouveaux *initiés*—le mot n'est pas trop fort, et c'est la chose que le chevalier de Méré a dans l'esprit lorsqu'il avance qu'il suffirait d'un honnête homme pour amener à l' "honnêteté" toute une Cour barbare.

Une fort juste observation de M. Réau rappelle l'absence de toute "propagande" organisée pour cette transmission de valeurs—et dans certains cas des esprits aussi clairvoyants que Vauban s'affligeaient de cette indifférence même. Elle garantissait la parfaite loyauté de l' "offre" faite par la civilisation française—mais elle oblige aujourd'hui encore la postérité à y regarder d'assez près. Croirait-on que M. Réau n'a pas un mot pour le point de départ démontré de tout ce mouvement, et qui n'est ni l'achèvement de Versailles (page 3), ni la commodité d'une langue auxiliaire, ni l'accumulation des chefs-d'œuvre, mais, édifiée sur une conception pessimiste de l'homme, l'idée que la société est faite pour corriger des imperfections trop évidentes? Non pas la société sans discrimination, mais l'élite appliquée à promouvoir, dans le cadre assez lâche des tutelles religieuses, une entente des mutualités de droits et de devoirs, de déférences et d'assertions propres à limiter l'égoïsme du haïssable *moi* tout en satisfaisant le *point d'honneur*, à refouler la bassesse de l'instinct tout en admettant d'autres formes de vie supérieure que l'ascétisme. Pas un mot des innombrables traités de savoir-vivre que multipliait à l'envi la France de 1670 et dont se réclamaient diplomates comme missionnaires, comédiens comme officiers. Si M. Réau prenait connaissance, aux archives des Affaires Etrangères, des lettres d'Eléonore d'Olbreuse, devenue duchesse régnante de Brunswick-Lunebourg, il verrait cette vaillante femme confier à Louis XIV la difficulté de son rôle, quand la tabagie, le pavillon de chasse, l'écurie, avec leur laisser-aller, font concurrence au "salon" qu'elle se pique de maintenir là-bas. Et la pauvre Louise de Kéroualle, si malmenée par l'histoire comme par les contemporains, avait à Whitehall des difficultés du même ordre. Dans la mesure où se démontrait l'excellence de la civilité française et où les classes moyennes en pleine ascension s'y intéressaient, se développait une action dont il faudrait se garder de croire qu'elle obéissait à un pur *farà da se*, "raison" cartésienne ou splendeur architecturale. En réalité, la sociabilité française arrive à réduire—dans une certaine mesure—le matérialisme flamand, la commodité alsacienne, l'incertitude rhénane, la rude franchise helvétique, la sobriété piémontaise et catalane,

parce que, à l'usage, des populations de frontière qui étaient au contact ont vu des hommes bien élevés, des femmes moins confinées dans le domestique ou dans le dévot, pratiquer et appliquer sans dommage ce séduisant altruisme de propos, de manières et de comportement qui était—on commence à s'en apercevoir pour la "préciosité" elle-même—une sorte de réincarnation, sans préjugé de classes, du sens chevaleresque et même de l'héroïsme courtois.

La vieille notion (dont Ferdinand Brunot avait reconnu l'insuffisance) selon laquelle un principe sacro-saint de *raison* absolue, partout accepté, aurait conféré son unité aux "lumières", celles-ci n'ayant plus qu'à étendre leur éclat persuasif, est un de "ces morts qu'il faut qu'on tue". De fait, l'Angleterre est infatigable dans son attachement à la *reasonableness of Christianity*,<sup>2</sup> l'Italie proclame bien vite une *ragione poetica* singulièrement limitative de notre cartésianisme littéraire, et *Verstand* ne tarde guère à voir *Vernunft* lui barrer certaines voies germaniques—sans que pour cela, avant la détérioration que nous verrons, l'agrément français enrichi, comme le dirent aussi bien le Dr. Johnson que Jean-Jacques Rousseau, d'une littérature facile d'approche et plaisante de tenue, cesse d'exercer un aimable empire.

C'est le cas de la Grande-Bretagne qui aiderait le mieux à faire comprendre le double jeu (qui n'est pas une action et une réaction séparées par des dates historiques, mais un fait continu de civilisation) dont profita si heureusement le siècle des lumières. Le distique de Churchill dans *The Rosciad* résumerait bien l'essentiel de l'affaire:

*French follies, universally embraced,  
At once provoked our mirth, and form our taste,*

car les protestations britanniques contre les empiètements parisiens, *kickshaws* des *beaux*, préférences vestimentaires des *coquettes*, *bagatelle* des voluptueux, sont en réalité de toujours, et Lord Chesterfield (de qui s'autorise trop aisément M. Réau après tant d'autres) tentait en réalité d'opérer une cote, plus ou moins bien taillée, entre des agréments qu'il connaissait et des "solidités" qu'il ne répudiait nullement pour une éducation parfaite: de quoi John Bull n'était qu'à demi satisfait. Gay n'attend pas au-delà de 1717 pour écrire:

*All Frenchmen are of petit-maitre kind . . .*

Dès que cette sociabilité française, avec tout ce qu'elle demandait d'initiative, mais aussi d'effacement dans les manières et les mouvements de l'esprit et même du cœur, perdit de vue son propre mérite et sa raison d'être, en particulier son pessimisme de base, les temps étaient mûrs pour un étiolement de nos mérites relatifs. C'est de ce déchet que s'avisent même nos partisans—à plus forte raison des adversaires que, suivant de trop près les vues erronées de M. L. Reynaud, M. Réau serait tenté d'accuser de sombres complots et d' "organisation". Puisque, non sans raison, il considère Frédéric II comme la plus brillante conquête de la France des lumières, il serait mal venu à récuser les

3. Formule fréquente chez les fidéistes anglais, et que *De ratione fidei* avait précédée.

réserves que fait un élève de Racine, de Rollin (négligé fâcheusement, page 89), des Réfugiés et de Louis XIV tout ensemble, quand la vertu positive de la France lui semble dévier, et qu'il se désabonne de la *Correspondance littéraire*:

J'aime beaucoup vos Velches quand ils ont du bons sens et de l'esprit . . . mais ma faculté admirative ou admiratrice étant restreinte à de certaines bornes, il m'est impossible d'englober dans ces actes de vénération des avortons du Parnasse, des philosophes à paradoxes et à sophismes, de faux beaux esprits, etc. (à d'Alembert, 28 juillet 1774).

C'est l'heure où Hamann, dix ans traducteur de français, déclare son dégoût d'une langue comme "énervée". De fait, les temps sont révolus pour un automatisme, dirait M. Bergson, qui croit remplacer la vie. Dès que la sociabilité française se montre atrophie, artificielle, fardée et médiocre conseillère de moralité et de pensée, les circonstances favorisent le citoyen de Genève, que M. Réau embrigade, en raison de la langue, dans la cohorte française . . . Et pourtant! Ne pas marquer une suffisante différence entre l'action dévolue désormais à une génération "sans gêne" et celles qui avaient précédé, c'est accueillir, sous prétexte que "c'est toujours de la peinture", un réaliste néerlandais à côté d'un styliste classique. Et c'est bien de quoi s'avisèrent à merveille nos clients du dehors: comment Diderot frappant sur les genoux de Catherine II aurait-il paru continuer à sa manière Descartes apparaissant "en tenue" devant Christine aux heures embrumées d'un hiver suédois? Peut-on croire que Beaumarchais à Madrid ou à Vienne, Goudar à Naples en 1767 ou de Sade en Savoie en 1772 rassuraient à fond leurs hôtes sur le savoir-vivre agnostique des Français intellectuels, comme avaient pu le faire Saint-Evremond ou Bayle lui-même, Condillac à Parme et Vaugelas à Turin? Et les "projets" *a priori* où légifèrait la toute-puissante *raison* semblaient manquer de cette objectivité que beaucoup d'étrangers avaient déjà trouvée déficiente dans Descartes. Que s'ajoute à ce discrédit celui qui semblera résulter de notre fameuse "anarchie spontanée", et bien rares seront les mainteneurs de notre prestige aux alentours de 93. Quand s'opérera un redressement que M. Réau a raison de proclamer, il s'appuiera sur des mérites modifiés en partie. Car les temps sont venus, cette fois, d'une croissante importance donnée à l'Etat, non seulement dans l'encadrement de la société, mais dans une structure où s'atténuera la complexité et la souplesse d'une société désireuse d'être à elle-même son principe et sa fin.

Et d'ailleurs, dans ce plan international où se place la "Collection" tout entière dont fait partie le présent volume, n'y aurait-il pas un inconvénient immédiat à faire trop bon marché de la sociabilité, active et pratique, dont les "lumières" furent l'irradiation? A relire les pages consacrées par M. Réau au triomphe de l'art français, à y ajouter par la pensée ce qu'il y aurait à dire en matière de philosophie et de pédagogie, on se prend à voir avant tout, dans cet épanouissement incontestable, une divulgation infiniment distinguée, *sous l'angle social*, de concepts anglais en métaphysique et en littérature "pro-



gressiste", de suggestions italiennes au théâtre, en architecture, en musique et dans d'autres arts mineurs. Ces dernières ne font pas doute pour le "comparatiste". Des premières collaborations, l'Angleterre s'avisait avant Buckle cité page 351:

*The weighty bullion of one sterling line,  
Drawn to French wire, would thro' whole pages shine* (W. Dillon, 1684).

Ou, comme l'écrivait Addison à Congreve, de Blois, en 1699: "If the French do not excell the English in all the arts of humanity, at least they do in the outward expression of it. . ."

Balancement équitable des mérites, on le voit, qui durera jusqu'à une rupture assez générale d'équilibre dont la faute n'est pas tout entière à l' "Europe française" cédant à la gallophobie.

Puisqu'en somme le passage de Montesquieu à Voltaire, dans les préférences françaises aussi bien que dans les offres à l'Europe (donc l'abandon d'une curiosité studieuse et enjouée pour un *a-priorisme* spirituel et cynique) est, en quelque sorte, le "pont tournant" de l'affaire, M. Réau permettra à l'auteur de ce compte-rendu de citer une fois de plus un passage qu'il semble ignorer, et qui sans doute explique à la fois pourquoi son livre lui paraît en *porte-à-faux* et pourquoi la prééminence française était menacée d'abord *par l'intérieur*:

La Nation qui dans les pays étrangers n'est jamais touchée que de ce qu'elle a quitté; qui, en partant de chez elle, regarde la gloire comme le souverain bien et, dans les lieux éloignés, comme un obstacle à son retour; qui y révolte par ses bonnes qualités mêmes, parce qu'elle y joint toujours du mépris: qui peut supporter les périls et les blessures et non pas la perte de ses plaisirs; qui sait mieux se procurer des succès qu'en profiter, et, dans une défaite, ne perd pas mais abandonne; qui fait toujours la moitié des choses admirablement bien et toujours très mal l'autre; qui n'aime rien tant que la gaîté et oublie la perte d'une bataille lorsqu'elle a chanté le général, n'aurait jamais été au bout d'une pareille entreprise, parce qu'elle est de nature à ne pouvoir guère échouer dans un endroit sans tomber dans tous les autres, et manquer un moment sans manquer pour toujours (Montesquieu, *Réflexions sur la monarchie universelle en Europe*).

Il s'agit là, bien entendu, d'entreprises qui ne sont pas uniquement intellectuelles ou artistiques: mais quiconque a une expérience variée et prolongée de ces complexes problèmes sera d'accord pour admettre une part, en tout cas, de ces vues clairvoyantes. Et la vraie conclusion pourrait être que, sans être devenue plus "éclairée" au fond, l'Europe a vu plus clair dans ce qu'il est de mode d'appeler son "dynamisme" à partir de 1770 environ.

FERNAND BALDENSPERGER

Harvard University



*Louise Colet et ses amis littéraires.* Par JOSEPH F. JACKSON. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1937. Pp. 388.

Tout au plus ne s'agit-il ici, Mr. Jackson en convient de fort bonne grâce, que d'une demi-réhabilitation. Celle qui voulut se faire appeler "la Muse", et qui n'en fut point, ma foi, tellement indigne, eut le tort d'écrire et de publier une quarantaine de volumes de son cru. Or, les Muses ne sont faites que pour inspirer: ce qui implique, avec la beauté, une faculté héroïque de silence. Juliette Récamier, que Mme Colet ne manqua pas de choisir pour l'un de ses modèles, l'avait admirablement compris. Elle y a gagné, sans coup férir, d'entrer vivante dans l'histoire et dans la légende.<sup>1</sup>

Au lieu que Louise Colet . . . Disons-le franchement: les extraits de vers et de prose que Mr. Jackson nous prodigue généreusement, qu'il a raison de nous prodiguer, car ils constituent un témoignage précieux sur une société et sur une époque, ces extraits, littérairement parlant, ne méritent que l'oubli. Même ceux pour lesquels Hugo et d'autres se montrèrent diplomatiquement indulgents. Même ceux que Mr. Jackson renonce à annoter d'un "sic" ironique et du reste arbitraire: pourquoi ne pas laisser au lecteur le soin de faire, et sans doute de multiplier, ses propres marques au crayon rouge? Non, la cause semble jugée: Banville se montra indulgent le jour où il concéda à Louise Colet "une branche, si mince et frêle qu'elle soit, du divin laurier"; M. de Bersaucourt élargit jusqu'au néant le concept de poésie lorsqu'il prétend qu'elle fut poète "par son inquiétude métaphysique et son sentiment de la nature".<sup>2</sup> Qui donc, à ce compte, n'aurait été poète au moins une fois en sa vie?

La question se pose, en définitive, de savoir comment cette femme sans génie, peut-être sans talent, s'il est vrai que le talent réside essentiellement dans la mesure et dans le goût, réussit à attacher à ses pas, pour un temps plus ou moins long, et Cousin, et Villemain, Musset lui-même, et, bien entendu, Flaubert. Impossible d'imaginer que la première venue ait pu susciter pareil concours d'admirateurs, exercer une influence, même perlée, sur la pensée de son temps, fonder un salon assez prestigieux pour que certaines sommités de l'époque acceptassent allégrement de venir s'y morfondre. C'est par là que Louise Colet mérite réellement son nom de Muse. On peut estimer à cet égard que la postérité, trop prompte à endosser les épigrammes d'Alphonse Karr et de Du Camp, lui fut tant soit peu cruelle. Il fallait sans doute, pour remettre les choses au point, que Louise Colet trouvât un biographe étranger, sans partis pris comme sans illusions, bonhomme avec finesse et sévère équitablement.

Elle était belle, tout le monde est d'accord sur ce point. Junon plutôt que Vénus, elle possédait ce genre d'"avantages" que les romantiques, épris de

1. Pourquoi Mr. Jackson, dont l'exactitude est quasi irrécusable, affuble-t-il Mme Récamier du prénom de Julie (cf. pp. 144, 145, etc.)? C'est trop tirer du côté Rousseau ce qui est décidément côté Shakespeare.

2. Cf. A. de Bersaucourt, "L'autre Louise Colet," dans *Revue du Temps Présent*, juin-juillet 1913.

grâces chlorotiques, mais dans leurs livres seulement, se gardaient bien de mépriser. Victor Cousin se souvint d'elle "pour recréer sa chère Mme de Longueville". Quant à Flaubert, lorsqu'il consentait à descendre des hauteurs de l'Art pur pour satisfaire certaines passions élémentaires et somme toute fort bourgeoises, il savait apprécier les charmes à la Rubens. C'est même cette façon cavalière de traiter Louise Colet comme une autre almée d'Egypte et de lui demander quelques nuits parcimonieuses arrachées à Madame Bovary, ce qui blessa le plus profondément la Muse, qui croyait incarner la Femme éternelle et rêvait de l'Amour avec un A majuscule. "Ce Flaubert,—s'écrie de bon cœur Mr. Jackson,—quel drôle d'amoureux tout de même!" Eh oui! quel drôle d'amoureux! Dans cette liaison (ne disons pas: "cette affaire", qui sonne par trop comme un anglicisme), le Viking fut loin d'avoir toujours le plus beau rôle. Sachons gré à Mr. Jackson de porter en la matière des jugements pondérés et délicats.

Si olympienne qu'elle fût, la beauté de Louise Colet n'avait rien de marbre, bien que Pradier l'ait voulu sculpter: elle irradiait, au contraire, un feu tout méridional. Sans doute hésitera-t-on à suivre Mr. Jackson dans le parallèle un peu risqué qu'il établit entre les sautes de température de la ville d'Aix, berceau de notre Muse, et les écarts violents dont celle-ci était coutumière. Telle quelle, l'explication serait plutôt simple; mais, ce qu'il y a de sûr, c'est que le Midi tout entier, ou la Provence si l'on veut, à défaut d'Aix en particulier, offrent un commentaire assez éloquent aux frénésies de Louise Colet, à ses ébullitions, ses élans de cœur, ses rancunes, en un mot à son coup de soleil perpétuel. Il n'en fallait pas plus pour attirer vers elle, le temps de s'y brûler, tous ces fils de la pluie, ces Parisiens, ces Normands sans cesse hantés par l'appel de la lumière. La séduction irrésistible que Paris exerce sur les Méridionaux n'a d'égale que celle du mirage méditerranéen pour les riverains de la Seine et de la Manche. Victimes volontaires de ce double courant, Flaubert et Louise Colet lui durent de se connaître, de s'aimer et de se haïr. Alphonse Daudet, qui, tout jeune encore, s'en vint faire visite à la Muse dans son salon de la rue de Sèvres, eût pu écrire là-dessus une jolie page.

Les qualités de Louise Colet formeraient, en somme, un ensemble assez riche, s'il ne s'y glissait comme un arrière-goût de vulgarité. Cette tare, on le sait, est la rançon fréquente du clinquant méridional. Le tact, le tact souverain de Mme Récamier, demeure chose absolument étrangère à cette femme exubérante, avide de gestes et d'effets théâtraux. Il faut croire que ses amis et protecteurs n'y regardaient pas de si près, ou de si loin. Aujourd'hui, toutes perspectives une fois rétablies, le portrait sans ombres que trace Mr. Jackson est bien fait pour nous convaincre que tout ce qui brille n'est pas or.

Me trompé-je? Mr. Jackson, dont le livre est entraînant à souhait, dont le français est étonnamment dru et vigoureux, a subi par ci par là la contagion de son sujet et commis quelques fautes de goût. Pour vouloir faire "vivant", il lui arrive de dégrader son style. Dans un ouvrage dit savant, la règle du jeu

ne permet guère des phrases comme celles-ci: "Chateaubriand était comme qui dirait le recordman des hommages reçus" (page 57), ou: "Cela ne justifierait nullement une revanche de la part de la Muse, mais ça pourrait constituer une circonstance atténuante" (page 83), ou bien: "On dirait un écolier qui veut se donner campos" (page 126), ou encore ce calembour douteux: "La Muse affirme qu'elle ne rencontra Cousin qu'après sa tournée de reconnaissance" [= gratitude] (page 84). On trouverait d'autres exemples de ce laisser-aller: ils sont trop rares, heureusement, pour déparer un travail fort et substantiel, qui a chance de rester longtemps le dernier mot sur les grandeurs et les misères de Louise Colet.

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

Columbia University

---

*Four French Novelists.* By GEORGES LEMAITRE. New York, Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp. xx+419.

These long essays on Proust, Gide, Giraudoux and Morand are for the lay public, which will find them enlightening . . . and pedestrian. The specialized academic public will appreciate the difficulty of the author's task . . . and be conscious of inadequacies in his work. The book is conscientious, methodical and clear, but it is handicapped from the start and the handicaps were not unavoidable.

For some reason, although he discusses at length many things which could reasonably have been omitted, Professor Lemaître makes little effort to place his authors in the perspective of recent French literary history and gives no clue as to what preceded and perhaps determined their rise to fame. Yet his layman reader would profit by knowing that interest in the subconscious antedates Proust, that Gide's search for a way of life started years before Gide was born, that others broke the way for Giraudoux and Morand. Moreover, since Professor Lemaître writes in English, it is hard to see why he turns his back on the chance to illumine Proust's interest in the subconscious by comparison with Joyce, Proust's theory of time with Shakespeare's two clocks and, more generally, to make as much enlightening reference as possible to English literature, with which his reader is presumably much more familiar than with the French. His work would have been less complicated had he grasped both opportunities.

His Proust is faithful to Pierre-Quint, and especially to Professor Feuillerat with whom he agrees in making Proust a psychologist in the Stendhal-Bourget tradition and in suppressing the traces of symbolism in the *Temps perdu*. Would it not be well, especially in an introduction to Proust, to admit that symbolism and psychological insight are not inimicable, that the psychological experience of discovering keys to the past operates by the recognition of symbols, that students of pathological phantasy have recognized this

fact for two decades at least, and that Proust looms no less great for having fused the two techniques? Not to admit this is to make a onesided interpretation . . . like Professor Lemaitre's, which the layman will eventually abandon for one more complete.

With the chapters on Gide and Giraudoux one may quarrel at two points. The treatment of French "classical" education and its effect on Giraudoux is inadequate to explain a subject which, to Americans at least, is necessarily esoteric; and since one of his principal points has to do with Giraudoux's attempt to reconcile the French classical temper with life in our un-classical modern chaos, the inadequacy is costly. Likewise, it is a mystery why after discussing Proust's debt to Bergson he does not discuss Gide's, since the latter debt involves the fascinating but obscure question of the gratuitous act. Here again the author has not been too aware of the needs of his audience.

Why he places Paul Morand in the company of the three others is not clear. While it may be quite true that Morand is the spokesman for the post-war period of glitter, speed-worship, disillusion and moral debility, what becomes of him as a significant novelist if it turns out that the group he represents had nothing significant to say? Professor Lemaitre unwittingly contributes to our uncertainty when he quotes as being particularly characteristic of the "Lost Generation" the following from *Ouvert la nuit*. "Mûrir? On durcit à de certaines places, on pourrit à d'autres: on ne mûrit pas." However meaningful these words may be today, they were just as apt a century ago when Sainte-Beuve, from whom Morand has borrowed, wrote them in the *Portraits contemporains* (Tome V, p. 461)! One may permissibly remain unconvinced.

All in all, this work of *haute vulgarisation*, bridging the gap between what the specialist knows and what the general public wants to learn, required accuracy of information, a flair for what the reader can be trusted to know, and sprightliness to keep him awake. Professor Lemaitre's prose is not sprightly. For Americans, his book lacks two characteristics which in America are desiderata: quality and salesmanship.

W. M. FROHOCK

Columbia University

---

*The Raeto-Romans.* By PEIDER LANSEL. Translated by M. Elizabeth Maxfield. Chur, Bischofberger, 1937. Pp. 32.

On February 19 and 20, 1938, the people of Switzerland voted with impressive unanimity to raise Romansh, or Raeto-Romance, the Benjamin of Romance philology, to the status of a fourth national language. Spoken roughly by 40,000 people who live in the mountain valleys of the Canton of the Grisons, Romansh henceforth will enjoy the protection and moral and material support of the Swiss federal government.

59326B

This act of recognition is the fruit of intelligent efforts carried on over a period of fifty years by a movement known as the "Raetian renaissance." For centuries, situated between two such strong linguistic forces as German and Italian and in the nineteenth century particularly threatened by the large influx of cosmopolitan elements that came to settle, the Romansh idiom began to show signs of linguistic decadence. There was cause for alarm at this situation, and a strong reaction set in which found expression in various local organizations determined to rescue and preserve the *mumma romontscha*, *mumma carina*. In 1919 these organizations were effectively coordinated in the *Lia Rumantscha*. Today Romansh is tremendously alive again and productive and steadily gaining ground in the Grisons and making friends at home and abroad.

The contentions of certain Italians that Romansh was an Italian, *i.e.* Lombard dialect, added interest to recent events. The Raeto-Romans energetically reacted against the pretended "italianità" and its implications and wrote on their banner: *Ni Talians, ni Tudais-chs! Rumantschs vulains restar!* (Neither Italians, nor Germans! We want to remain Romansh!)

The treatise of Dr. Linsel, Romansh poet and scholar, deserves special attention in this country where Romansh has been little studied. It is an admirable, concise introduction to the Raeto-Romans, their history and language and literature, with especially valuable references to research already completed and work in progress. The notes contain an up-to-date bibliography and a linguistic map. The little study, ably translated, belongs in every Romance library.

WILLIAM FRAUENFELDER

*Bard College, Columbia University*

---

*Saint Léger, Etude de la langue du manuscrit de Clermont-Ferrand, suivie d'une édition critique du texte avec commentaire et glossaire.* Par JOSEPH LINSKILL. Paris, E. Droz, 1937. Pp. 192.

This is a painstaking, carefully planned piece of work under the skillful direction of Professor Hoepffner of the University of Strasbourg. The introduction which occupies the first 147 pages is a thorough discussion of the linguistics of the poem and therefore to a certain extent a picture of the language of the tenth century.

Joseph Linskill agrees with most philologists that the text belongs to the "langue d'oïl" but was copied by a scribe of Provençal speech, and he never misses an opportunity to prove it.

Would not something have been gained in some cases if, instead of judging the language of the poem according to a general conception of what Old French is, the state of tenth-century French had been more often deduced from the language of the poem? For instance, in regard to the important problem

of the pronunciation of French *u* (from *û*), he says: "Malgré le maintien de cette voyelle dans l'orthographe, il est certain [?] qu'elle a passé à la voyelle palatale *ü* avant l'époque littéraire. Dans les plus anciens textes français et provençaux, y compris le nôtre, le son provenant de *û* tonique n'assonne qu'avec lui-même et ne se confond jamais avec le son vélaire (écrit *ou*) provenant de *o* fermé. Cela prouve que la voyelle *u* avait en français un son distinct et particulier, qui ne pouvait être autre que le son actuellement prononcé" (page 16).

This proves nothing. The pronunciation of *o* was very different from *u*. Why should it have been confused in assonances? The author himself has shown that Latin *o*, free or checked, was pronounced *o* or *o*<sup>u</sup> and never *u* (F. *ou*): he admits that checked *o* hardly passed to *u* (F. *ou*) before the thirteenth century. So these assonances do not throw any light on the problem of the evolution from *u* to *ü* in French.

The author discusses (page 89) the possessive *son* (vs. 31) and considers strange that it should be used in a stressed position: he is inclined to see in this an influence of Provençal. Yet without making a thorough inquiry into the problem, I find in Roland (cxx): *Respont Rollans: ne pois amer les voz*; Villehardouin (218): *et traïoient as noz*; in Girbert de Metz (Montpellier MS 178.3) *Gerins fiert l'autre et Mauris le son*. As for the opinion expressed by the author that it is improbable that the poet should have used the same form in the same text with different values, here again Girbert de Metz (209.1) has: *Au son seant ont le conte levé*. On the other hand as late as the fourteenth century, the *Miracle de l'enfant donné au diable* has in the same function both stressed and unstressed forms within a few lines: 484, *Pais et grace a vo doult hoir*; 490, *S'en vostre secours a fiance*.

The language of Northern France was never so settled as to preclude all variations from the norm, still less at this early period. The moment we have to deal with an etymological form we should not assume too early a foreign or dialectal influence. Both etymological and analogical forms will, for a long time, be used side by side.<sup>1</sup> This is why Lücking's explanation of *devemps* < \**debemmus* and *cantomps* < \**cantammus* is not to be easily dismissed. The gemination of the *m* in the first person plural is not infrequent in the eighth-century texts. Pei<sup>2</sup> gives five cases of *jobimmus*; also *diberimmus*, *conservam-mus*, *mancaepammus*. It is evidently connected with the general phenomenon of gemination in Vulgar Latin<sup>3</sup> and may very well have assumed, in this case, a morphological value.

For a similar reason the use of *ab* for "with" is not, to my mind, a Provençalism. In the Merovingian period, the Latin preposition *ab* developed more and

1. The author himself discusses the coexistence of *tenir* and *teneir* > *tencoir*, respectively from *tenire* and *tenere*.

2. Mario Pei, *The Language of the Eighth-Century Texts in Northern France*, p. 114, where other references are given.

3. E. Kiecker, *Historische lateinische Grammatik*, München, 1930, p. 122.



more the classical connotations which resulted in a new semantic value of "with" which it has in the "Oaths" and the older texts, while *apud* became \*awud, \*aud, od. *Ab*, later, was replaced, in the North, by its derived adverbial form *ab hoc* < *avec* which finally crowded out the *od*, *o* from *apud*. *Apud* could nowhere have become *ab* and such a supposition is useless.<sup>4</sup>

*Ab* with the meaning of *avec* is frequent in Merovingian and Carolingian texts in the North of France, and when we find it in the "Oaths," the "Passion" and "St. Léger," it seems clear that it only continues the earlier usage in the same region.

The suggestion (page 45) about the name of Guenes for one of the subalterns of the malefactor Ebrouin and one of the persecutors of Léger (instead of Guenin which would be the French form for Waningus of the Latin text) is certainly interesting: Linskill thinks it may be due to the Roland legend. Everything that can bear on this question must be carefully noted.

I have discussed at length certain points of the introduction because this edition with its accompanying commentaries is very valuable and deserves a thorough study and consideration. The notes in the text proper are copious and to the point and the glossary complete and very helpful.

Columbia University.

HENRI F. MULLER

4. H. F. Muller, *A Chronology of Vulgar Latin*, Halle, 1929, pp. 53 ff.



## BOOKS RECEIVED

- Aish, Deborah A. K., *La Métaphore dans l'œuvre de Stéphane Mallarmé*. Paris, Droz, 1938. Pp. 210.
- An *Analytical Bibliography of Modern Language Teaching, 1932-1937*. Vol. II. Compiled and edited for the Committee on Modern Languages by Algeron Coleman, with the assistance of Clara Breslove King. Chicago, University of Chicago, 1938. Pp. xviii + 561.
- Bell, Aubrey F. G., *Castilian Literature*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp. xiv + 261.
- Burnet, Mary Scott, *Marc-Antoine Legrand, acteur et auteur comique (1673-1728)*. Paris, Droz, 1938. Pp. 199.
- Byam, Edwin C., *Théodore Barrière, Dramatist of the Second Empire*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. 338.
- Cianciòlo, Umberto, *Il Simbolismo mistico di Baudelaire*. Firenze, "La Nuova Italia" Editrice, 1938. Pp. 23.
- Clark, Ruth, *Sir William Trumbull in Paris, 1685-1686*. New York, Macmillan, 1938. Pp. xi + 231.
- Creed, Elizabeth, *Le Dandysme de Jules Barbey d'Aurévilly*. Paris, Droz, 1938. Pp. 131.
- Dario, Rubén, *Poesías y prosas raras*. Compiladas y anotadas por Julio Saavedra Molina. Santiago, Prensas de la Universidad de Chile, 1938. Pp. 106.
- Gallagher, Maurice, *Baour-Lormian: Life and Works, 1770-1854*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, 1938. Pp. 98.
- Gottschalk, Walter, *Die Bildhaften Sprichwörter der Romanen*. III: "Schlusskapitel und Register." Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1938. Pp. viii + 467.
- Gracián, Baltasar, *El Criticón*. Edición crítica y comentada por M. Romera-Navarro. Tomo Primero. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938. Pp. vii + 404.
- Gueullette, J.-E., *Thomas Simon Gueullette: Un Magistrat du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, ami des lettres, du théâtre et des plaisirs*. Paris, Droz, 1938. Pp. 199.
- Haley, Sister Marie Philip, *Racine and the "Art Poétique" of Boileau*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. 245.
- Hawkins, Richmond L., *Positivism in the United States (1853-1861)*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1938. Pp. vii + 243.
- Hooker, Kenneth Ward, *The Fortunes of Victor Hugo in England*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. xiii + 333.
- Iordan, Iorgu, *An Introduction to Romance Linguistics: Its Schools and Scholars*. Revised, translated and in parts recast by John Orr. London, Methuen, 1937. Pp. xi + 403.

- Kleine Schriften von Wilhelm Heraeus.* Selected and edited by J. B. Hofmann. Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1937. Pp. xvi + 267.
- La Fontaine, *Discours à Madame de La Sablière (sur l'âme des animaux).* Commentaire littéraire et philosophique par H. Busson et F. Gohin. Paris, Droz, 1938. Pp. 105.
- Le Lucidaire.* Texte et étude par J. Nachbin. Paris, Publications Elucidarium, 1938. Pp. xlvii + 55.
- Lote, Georges, *La Vie et l'œuvre de François Rabelais.* Paris, Droz, 1938. Pp. 574 + 16 planches hors-texte.
- Malkiel, J. *Das substantivierte Adjektiv im Französischen.* Berlin, Joseph Jastrow, 1938. Pp. viii + 139.
- Manacorda, Guido, *Dante: Ein Lebensbild.* Wessobrunner, Verlag, 1938. Pp. 42.
- The Meaning of the Humanities.* Five Essays by Ralph B. Perry, August C. Krey, Erwin Panofsky, Robert L. Calhoun, Gilbert Chinard. With preface by Robert K. Root. Edited with an introduction by T. M. Greene. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1938. Pp. xxxix + 178.
- Mérimée, Prosper, *Lettres à Fanny Lagden.* (Texte anglais et traduction). Publiées par Ed. Champion, G. Connes, P. Trahard. Paris, Boivin, 1938. Pp. xxii + 281.
- Molina, Julio S., *Los hexámetros castellanos y en particular los de Rubén Darío.* Santiago, Prensas de la Universidad de Chile, 1935. Pp. 90.
- Mönch, Walter, *Frankreichs Literatur im XVI. Jahrhundert.* Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1938. Pp. xiii + 333.
- Müller, Walter, *Die Grundbegriffe der Gesellschaftlichen Welt in den Werken des Abbé Prévost.* Marburg, Verlag von Hans Michaelis-Braun, 1938. Pp. vi + 100.
- Nitze, William A., and E. Preston Dargan, *A History of French Literature from the Earliest Times to the Present.* Third Edition. New York, Holt, 1938. Pp. xi + 852.
- The Old French Lives of St. Agnes, and other vernacular versions of the Middle Ages.* Edited with an introduction by Alexander Joseph Denomy. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1938. Pp. xi + 283.
- Pellegrini, Carlo, *Madame de Staël.* Firenze, Felice Le Monnier, 1938. Pp. 221.
- Penney, Clara L., *List of Books Printed 1601-1700 in the Library of the Hispanic Society of America.* New York, Hispanic Society, 1938. Pp. xxvi + 972.
- Petriconi, Hellmuth, *Spanisch-Amerikanische Romane der Gegenwart.* Hamburg, Verlag Conrad Behre, 1938. Pp. 61.
- Peyre, Henri, *Hommes et œuvres du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle.* Paris, Editions Corrêa, 1938. Pp. 345.
- Pitou, Spire, Jr., *La Calprenède's "Faramond." A Study of the Sources, Structure, and Reputation of the Novel.* Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. 174.

- Poèmes de transition (XV<sup>e</sup>-XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles). Rondeaux du MS 402 de Lille.* Edited by Marcel Françon. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1938. Pp. 771.
- Predmore, Richard L., *An Index to Don Quijote, Including Proper Names and Notable Matters.* New Brunswick, Rutgers University, 1938. Pp. x+102.
- Privitera, Joseph F., *Charles Chevillet de Champmeslé, Actor and Dramatist (1642-1701).* With a critical edition of his hitherto unpublished play, *La Veuve.* Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. 179.
- Pure, Abbé Michel de, *La Prétieuse ou le Mystère des ruelles.* Texte publié d'après l'édition originale avec une notice inédite sur l'Abbé de Pure, une bibliographie et des notes par Emile Magne. Paris, Droz, 1938. Pp. xcii + 395.
- Raya, Gino, *Storia della letteratura italiana.* Vol. III: "Dal Rinnovamento al Fascismo." Milano, Società Anonima Editrice Dante Alighieri, 1938-XVI. Pp. vii + 228.
- Renaut [De Beaujeu], *Le Lai d'Ignaure ou Lai du prisonnier.* Edited by Rita Lejeune. Brussels, Palais des Académies, 1938. Pp. 74.
- Ross, Flora Emma, *Goethe in Modern France.* Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1937. Pp. 234.
- Ruhm, Oskar, *Ariostos Rasender Roland. Form und Aufbau.* Eützburg-Anmühle, Konrad Triltsch Verlag, 1938. Pp. 170.
- Selected Poems of Giovanni Pascoli.* Edited by G. S. Purkis. New York, Macmillan, 1938. Pp. 107.
- Spell, Jefferson R., *Rousseau in the Spanish World Before 1833. A Study in Franco-Spanish Literary Relations.* Austin, The University of Texas Press, 1938. Pp. 325.
- Starkie, Walter, *The Waveless Plain. An Italian Autobiography.* New York, Dutton, 1938. Pp. xviii + 509.
- Strauss, Franz, *Vulgärlatein und Vulgärsprache im Zusammenhang der Sprachenfrage im 16. Jahrhundert (Frankreich und Italien).* Marburg, Verlag von Hans Michaelis-Braun, 1938. Pp. 131.
- Torrey, Norman L., *The Spirit of Voltaire.* New York, Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. xiii + 314.
- Translations from Hispanic Poets.* New York, Hispanic Society of America, 1938. Pp. xvi + 271.
- Valkhoff, Marius, *Philologie et littérature wallonnes. Vade-mecum.* Groningen, J. B. Wolters, 1938. Pp. 161.
- Varona, Enrique J., *Desde mi Belvedere.* Havana, Edición Oficial, 1938. Pp. 224.
- Voltaire, *Le Temple du goût.* Edition critique par E. Carcassone. Paris, Droz, 1938. Pp. 196.
- Von Der Mühl, Emanuel, *Denis Veiras et son histoire des Sévarambes (1677-1679).* Paris, Droz, 1938. Pp. 292.

- Wartburg, W. von, *Evolution et structure de la langue française*. 2nd edition. Leipzig, Teubner, 1937. Pp. viii + 290.
- Wilcox, John, *The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. ix + 240.
- Williams, Edwin B., *From Latin to Portuguese: Historical Phonology and Morphology of the Portuguese Language*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938. Pp. xii + 315.
- Wills, Arthur, *España y Unamuno: un ensayo de apreciación*. New York, Instituto de las Españas, 1938. Pp. 375.
- The Works of Guillaume de Salluste Sieur Du Bartas*. A critical edition with introduction, commentary, and variants by Urban T. Holmes, Jr., John C. Lyons, and Robert W. Linker. Vol. II: "La Muse chrestienne," and "La Création du monde ou première semaine." Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. vii + 440.
- Wright, F. A., *Three Roman Poets: Plautus, Catullus, Ovid. Their Lives, Times and Works*. New York, Dutton, 1938. Pp. xi + 268.
- Zellers, Guillermo, *La novela histórica en España, 1828-1850*. New York, Instituto de las Españas, 1938. Pp. 168.

## TEXT-BOOKS

- FRENCH. About, Edmond, *Le Roi des montagnes*. Retold by L. C. Dahl, Clotilde Dahl, and Henri Pochard, Boston, Heath, 1938.—Bond, Otto F., *En Route! An Introductory French Grammar for Reading*, Boston, Heath, 1938.—Ceppi, Marc, *Les Emplois de Pierre Quiroule*, Boston, Heath, 1938.—Coleman, Algernon, *Intermediate French Course: Graded Readings and Grammar Review*, Boston, Heath, 1938.—Landry, J. A., *Graded French Word and Idiom Book*, Boston, Heath, 1938.—Wilkinson, G. T., *French Operatic Readings: The French Originals of Five Great Operas*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1938.
- ITALIAN. Cioffari, Vincenzo, and John Van Horne, *Amici di scuola: A Graded Italian Reader*, Boston, Heath, 1938.—*Dieci novelle contemporanee*. Con esercizi di grammatica, conversazione e composizione, A cura di Michele Cantarella e di Paul L. Richards, New York, Holt, 1938.—*Modern Italian Short Stories*. Edited with notes, exercises and vocabulary by Thomas G. Bergin, Boston, Heath, 1938.
- SPANISH. Calderón, Don Pedro, *El príncipe constante*. Edited by A. A. Parker, New York, Macmillan, 1938.—Kany, C. E., *Elementary Spanish Conversation*, Boston, Heath, 1938.—Sierra, Gregorio Martínez, *Rosina es frágil*. With notes, exercises, and vocabulary by C. E. Kany, Boston, Heath, 1938.—Sims, E. R., and R. S. Switzer, *Repaso y composición*, Boston, Heath, 1938.

## NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

---

1. All manuscripts should be typewritten and double-spaced with ample margins.
2. Quotations in any language of over four or five typewritten lines will generally be printed in small roman as separate paragraphs (set-down matter). In the typescript such extracts should be in a separate paragraph single-spaced and should not be enclosed in quotation marks.
3. Titles of books and periodicals will be italicized and should be underlined in the typescript. Titles of articles, chapters and poems should be in roman enclosed in quotation marks.
4. In titles of English publications, in titles of periodicals in any language except German, and in divisions of English works (parts, chapters, sections, poems, articles, etc.), the first word and all the principal words should be capitalized. Ex:

*The Comedy of Errors*

In the *Romanic Review* there appeared an article entitled "Flaubert's Correspondence with Louise Colet, Chronology and Notes."

Such a repetition may be found in the Preface. (But: James Gray wrote the preface for the second edition.)

5. In an English passage French titles should have the article capitalized and underlined as part of the title. Ex: He read *La France vivante*. In a French passage, the article should be neither capitalized nor underlined. Ex: Il a lu *la France vivante* et *l'Histoire de la littérature française* de Lanson.
6. In an English passage, French and Italian titles should be capitalized as follows. The first word is always capitalized. If a substantive immediately follows an initial article, definite or indefinite, it is also capitalized. If the substantive is preceded by an adjective, this also receives a capital letter. If the title begins with any other word than

an article or an adjective, the words following are all in lower-case. Ex: *Les Femmes savantes*; *La Folle Journée*; *L'Âge ingrat*; *De la terre à la lune*; *Sur la piste*; *La Leda senza cigno*; *Scrittori del tempo nostro*; *I Narratori*; *Nell'azzurro*; *Piccolo Mondo antico*.

7. Spanish titles should have a capital only on the first word unless the title contains a proper noun. Ex: *Cantigas de amor e de maldizer*; *La perfecta casada*.
8. Words or phrases not in the language of the article, and not yet naturalized, will be italicized and should be underlined in the typescript. Consult the dictionary if in doubt. Ex: *genre*, *pièce à thèse*, *ancien régime*, *Zeitgeist*.
9. All quotations should correspond exactly with the original in wording, spelling, and punctuation. Words or phrases in quotations must not be italicized or underlined unless they are so in the original or unless it is indicated in a footnote that the italics have been added. Any interpolation in an extract should be indicated by enclosing it in brackets; any omission should be indicated by three periods. Ex: "It is this work [*Le Lys dans la vallée*] which—"; "Il est . . . absorbé par des travaux—."
10. Footnotes should be numbered consecutively throughout each article or book-review. In the text the note number should be printed as a superior figure (slightly above the typed line); at the head of the note itself, it should be a figure of normal size followed by a period (on a level with the typed line). Ex: At eighteen, he moved to Paris.<sup>1</sup>

1. John Palmer, *Studies in the Contemporary Theatre*, p. 48.

11. Footnotes may be typed into the article itself, separated from the text by ruled lines, or subjoined to the end of the text, on separate pages.
12. Note numbers in the text always follow

- the punctuation. Ex: There is no question as to the date of this edition.<sup>2</sup> As Flaubert stated,<sup>3</sup> he was willing to—
13. Short references included in the text to save footnotes, should be enclosed in parentheses and should not contain abbreviations. In book-reviews this is often the easiest way to make a direct reference to the work which is being reviewed. Ex: In the Introduction (page 10), the author remarks—
  14. Names should never be abbreviated. Even the name of the author of a work which is being reviewed should be written out each time that it is used.
  15. All footnotes must begin with a capital letter and end with a period or some other final punctuation. Each note should contain an exact reference to the page or pages in question; the title is rarely enough. If a footnote refers to the same title cited in the preceding note, *ibid.* should be used to avoid repeating the title. If a note refers to a work already cited, but not cited in the preceding footnote, *op. cit.* should be used for a book, *loc. cit.* for an article. Such abbreviations should not ordinarily be used to refer farther back than the preceding page. Since the aim, however, is merely to avoid ambiguity, no rule need be laid down. Ex:
    10. Cross, Slover, *Ancient Irish Tales*, p. 35.
    11. Loomis, *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance*, p. 90.
    12. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97.
    13. W. A. Nitze, "Lancelot and Guenevere," *Speculum*, VIII, 240.
    14. Loomis, *op. cit.*, p. 131.
    15. Nitze, *loc. cit.*, p. 249.

16. In the citation of references the amount of bibliographical detail is left to the discretion of the contributor, but the order of the items should be presented as indicated below. Inclusion of items (3), (4), and (5) is optional with the contributor.

In the case of books cited, the form of reference should be as follows: (1) author's name, preceded by his first name or initials, (2) the title italicized

(underlined), (3) where necessary, the edition, (4) place of publication, (5) name of publisher, (6) date of publication, (7) reference to volume in capital roman numerals without preceding 'Vol.' or 'V.', (8) reference to page in arabic numerals, preceded by 'p.' or 'pp.' only when there is no preceding reference to volume. Each item but the last should be followed by a comma; the last item should be followed by a period. Ex:

Albert Thibaudet, *Histoire de la littérature française de 1789 à nos jours*, Paris, Stock, 1936, p. 60.

H. O. Taylor, *The Mediaeval Mind*, 4th ed., New York, Macmillan, 1925, II, 221-225.

17. Reference to periodicals should include, wherever possible, volume number and page number or numbers. Where it is desirable to give the year also, it should follow the volume number, in parentheses. When it is impossible to give a volume number, the date of the issue should take its place. Ex:

*La Nouvelle Revue Française*, II (1909), 224.

*Les Nouvelles Littéraires*, 30 juillet 1932, p. 8.

18. The following periodicals should be abbreviated as follows in footnotes:

*Gröbers Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*—GG

*Modern Language Journal*—MLJ

*Modern Language Notes*—MLN

*Modern Philology*—MP

*Publications of the Modern Language Association*—PMLA

*Romania*—R

*Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France*—RHL

*Revue de Littérature Comparée*—RLC

*Romanic Review*—RR

*Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*—ZFSL

*Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*—ZRP

19. The following Latin words and abbreviations will be italicized and should be underlined in typescript. They should be capitalized only when they begin a footnote. *ca.* (about, in dates) *e.g.* (for



instance), *et al.* (and others), *ibid.* (not *ib.* or *idem*, the same reference), *i.e.* (that is), *loc. cit.* (place cited), *op. cit.* (work cited), *passim* (here and there), *sic* (thus), *vs.* (versus). Exceptions are: etc., viz.

20. The following abbreviations will appear in roman type and therefore should not be underlined in typescript: cf., f., ff. (following), fol., foll. (folio, folios), l., ll. (line, lines), p., pp., vol., vs., vss. (verses). Mme and Mlle, MS and MSS (manuscript, manuscripts) should be typed without periods.
21. Headings for book-reviews should follow these models:

*Jules Sandeau, l'homme et la vie.* Par Mabel Silver. Paris, Boivin, 1936. Pp. 247.

*A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century.* By Professor Henry Carrington Lancaster. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press. *Part I* (1610-1634), 2 vols., 1929. Pp. 785. *Part II* (1635-1651), 2 vols., 1932. Pp. 804. *Part III* (1652-1672), 2 vols., 1936. Pp. 896.

22. All references in the completed manuscript should be verified before it is submitted for publication.
23. Contributors should retain an accurate carbon copy of their manuscripts.



